The GOSPEL According to the HEBREWS

J. T. DODD.

THE GOSPEL
ACCORDING TO THE
HEBREWS

J. THEODORE DODD.

229.8
H446D

STORAGE

McMASTER UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
229.8 .H446D
The Gospel according to the He C.1
3 9005 0470 9410 1

THE GOSPEL
ACCORDING TO
THE HEBREWS

By
J. THEODORE DODD, M.A., J.P.,
Barrister-at-Law.

1933
Printed privately for the Author by
THE SEARCH PUBLISHING COMPANY
6 Old Gloucester Street, London, W.C.1.

McMaster University
LIBRARY

Made and Printed in England by THE CLOCK HOUSE PRESS,
HODDESDON, HERTS.

PREFATORY NOTE

NO complete copy of this Gospel is known to be in existence. We only have fragments (indicated in this work by Fr). A list of them will be found at page vii. In quotations from the New Testament the Revised Version has usually been followed.

ABBREVIATIONS USED.

G.H.	"The Gospel according to the Hebrews."
Fr.	Fragments of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews."
E.T.	"Expository Times" (article by Mr. Dunkerley, July and August, 1928).
Westcott	Introduction to the "Study of the Gospels," by Dr. Westcott, afterwards Bishop Westcott, fourth edit., 1872.
Dodd	Sayings ascribed to Our Lord by the Father and other Primitive writers, and Incidents in His Life narrated by them otherwise than found in Scripture, by J. Theodore Dodd, 1874.

Abbreviations—continued.

Nicholson or N. ...	"The Gospel according to the Hebrews," its Fragments translated and annotated, with a critical analysis of the external and internal evidence relating to it, by Edward Byron Nicholson, 1879.
Dr. James	The Apocryphal New Testament, newly translated by Montague Rhodes James, Litt.D., F.B.A., F.S.A. Provost of Eton, etc., 1924.
S.P.C.K, Eusebius or simply Eusebius...	Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine translated with Introduction and Notes by Hugh Jackson Lawlor, D.D., Litt.D., and John Ernest Leonard Oulton, D.D., S.P.C.K., 1927.
Dr. Beecher	"The Holy Shroud," reply to the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J., by Rev. P. A. Beecher, D.D., 1928.
Gore	A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, including the Apocrypha. (Bishop Gore is the chief and dominant Editor of this work, so that though it is referred to simply as "Gore," it is possible that one of the other Editors may be the actual writer of the Article to which reference is made.) First published 1928.

TABLE OF ALL THE KNOWN FRAGMENTS IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS

Denoting No. of Fragment	Subject of Fragment or other Item	Parallel Passage	Page
	Chapter I, Part I, Introductory. This contains the opinions of a number of writers.		11
(1)	Appearance to Peter and Others (St. Ignatius)	Luke xxiv, 34, 40.	19
(2)	Appearance to James and the Priest's Servant (St. Jerome).	I Cor. xv, 7.	
(3)	THE VIRGIN BIRTH.		33
	Conversation before the Baptism of Jesus (St. Jerome).		
(4)	Forgiveness to 70 times 7 (St. Jerome).	Matt. xviii, 21.	
(5)	Baptism of Jesus (St. Jerome).	Matt. iii, 17.	
(6)	The Flight to Mount Tabor (Origen and St. Jerome) (The Odes of Solomon)	Matt. iv, 1 (?) Mark i, 12 (?)	
(7) (8) (9)	Marginal Notes on Matt. ii, 5; Matt. ii, 15; and ii, 23 (St. Jerome).		
	THE LIFE, TEACHING, AND MIRACLES OF JESUS.		55
(11)	Brotherly Love (St. Jerome).		

Denoting No. of Fragment	Subject of Fragment or other Item	Parallel Passage	Page
(12)	The same (St. Jerome).		55
(13)	Healing of man with withered hand.	Matt. xii, 13.	56
(14) (15)	Marginal Notes on Matt.		56
(16) (17)	xviii, 22; iv, 5; xvi, 17; xxvi, 74.		57
(18)	Barabbas (St. Jerome).	Matt. xxvii, 16.	57
(19)	Lintel of Temple (St. Jerome).	Matt. xxvii, 51.	57
(20)	The same (St. Jerome).		
(20a)	Osanna (St. Jerome).	Matt. xxi, 9.	59
(21)	To-morrow's Bread.	Matt. vi, 11.	59
(22)	Zachariah, the son of Joiada (St. Jerome).	Matt. xxiii, 35.	59
(23)	Woman accused of many sins (Papias).		60
(24)	He that wondered shall reign (St. Clement of Alexandria.		61
	Oxyrhynchus Papyrus findings.		61
(25)	Another rich man enquiring (Origen).	Matt. xix, 16-24.	62
(26)	Parable of the Talents (Eusebius).	Matt. xxv, 14-30.	65
(27)	I will select of Myself (Eusebius).		66
(28-34)	Marginal Notes on Matt. xxvii, 65; x, 16; xi, 12; xi, 25; xii, 40b; xv, 5; v, 22; vii, 5.		66
(35)	Bosom of the Father not doing His will, shall be cast away (this is a marginal note).		67

NOTE.

Where there is a similar passage in any Gospel besides St. Matthew I have only quoted St. Matthew.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFATORY NOTE.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED.

LIST OF EXTANT FRAGMENTS OF THE GOSPEL.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTORY 11

Authorities for and opinions as to the Gospel; Length of Gospel.

CHAPTER II: THE RESURRECTION 19

Appearance to the Apostles and others, to the Priest's Servant, and St. James.

CHAPTER III: THE VIRGIN BIRTH 33

The Virgin Birth and Mount Tabor.

CHAPTER IV 55

The Life Teaching and Miracles of Jesus (excluding the Resurrection and the Virgin Birth).

APPENDIX I 71

Peter as Convener

APPENDIX II 79

The Priest's Servant

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

"*For as much as many have taken in hand.*"—Luke i, 1.

AS far as is known, there is no complete copy of the Gospel of the Hebrews in existence, and only about thirty-seven Fragments of it which are known to be genuine remain, and most of them very tiny. The whole of these are contained in the following pages.

This Gospel is quoted as an authority by Hegesippus, St. Jerome, St. Clement of Alexandria,* and others of the early Christian writers. Mr. Baring Gould says,† before giving a list of

* Origen treats it as an authority but as a disputable one, see below. Probably Irenaeus refers to it, see Nicholson pp. 2–6.

† "Lost and Hostile Gospels," by Rev. S. Baring Gould, M.A. (1874), p. 128. Bishop Westcott, in his "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels," gives seventeen fragments; both these writers add a number of passages, which they think may belong to this Gospel. Mr. E. B. Nicholson in his work, "The Gospel according to the Hebrews" (C. Kegan Paul, 1879), gives thirty-three, including some doubtful ones; and Dr. Dunkerley in the "Expository Times" of July and August, 1928, cites fifteen of the fragments which he considers the more important.

about twenty quotations from that Gospel : " It is necessary to observe, as preliminary to our quotations, that the early Fathers cited passages from the Gospel without the smallest prejudice against it either historically or doctrinally. They do not seem to have considered it apocryphal, as open to suspicion, either because it contained doctrine at variance with the canonical Greek Gospels, or because it narrated circumstances not found in them. On the contrary, they refer to it as a good, trustworthy authority for the facts of our Lord's life, and for the doctrines He taught." It does not seem, however, to have been accepted by the Church as a whole, but only by the Nazarenes, a section of the Jewish Christians. Eusebius * tells us that this Gospel " was especially acceptable to such Hebrews as received the Christ."

Mr. E. B. Nicholson, in his very learned work on this Gospel, advances the theory or hypothesis " that Matthew wrote *at different times* the canonical Gospel and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or at least that large part of the latter which runs parallel to the former." † But this view is not generally accepted.

Of the high antiquity of this Gospel there can be no doubt. It was almost certainly written before the close of the first century, and most

* Eusebius III, xxv, 1, vol. ii, p. 87.

† P. 104.

modern commentators think it contains fragments of historical traditions and teaching of Jesus : and that some at least of them are genuine. These questions, however, will be discussed later.

Of the modern English books, Nicholson's is the most complete and thorough, and by far the best ; and I am deeply indebted to it, as it gives not only the quotations of this Gospel by the Fathers, but also the Latin and Greek Texts from which they are translated ; and finally Nicholson's notes are of the utmost value. Most of these texts will also be found in an Appendix to Bishop Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels.* In this article, I have given *all* the known fragments of the Gospel, and from Dr. James's book have been able to include some tiny fragments which are not in Nicholson's.*

That there is a large amount of Patristic evidence in favour of this Gospel will be seen from what has been said, and the reader is specially invited to look at Chapter IV of this paper, to satisfy himself on this point. So I will now give opinions from some more very modern sources.

I first take the following notes from Dr. Hastings' voluminous works. Speaking of this Gospel, he says :—

" Its anonymity, its primitive character, and the authority it afterwards enjoyed point to a very

* See p. 44 below.

early origin. It may have come into existence about the same time as the synoptic gospels, and in obedience to some at least of the same motives as led to their appearance."—Hastings, Dict. of the Bible, Extra Volume, p. 343.

"Internal and external evidence alike point strongly to the view that the Gospel of the Hebrews is an independent parallel version of the events described in the Synoptics (esp. in St. Matthew), and possibly formed one of the sources in the hands of St. Luke (ib., p. 348)."

Dr. James, in his work on the Apocryphal New Testament, says of it :— †

"This is on a different level from all the other books we have to deal with. It was a divergent yet not heretical form of our Gospel according to St. Matthew."

"S. Jerome tells us that a copy of it was preserved at Cæsarea, and he saw another copy at Syrian Beroea from which he translated it into Greek and Latin. It is thought that the Cæsarean copy may have belonged to Origen." *

"In two extant passages Origen (John ii, 12 ; Hom. in Jer. xv, 4) quotes the Gospel of the Hebrews, and in each instance the quotation is introduced with some such phrase as 'if one accepts the Gospel of the Hebrews.' With similar

† P. 1.

* S.P.C.K. Eusebius, vol. ii, notes, p. 95.

phrases he introduces references to the Book of Enoch, the Epistle of Jude, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Shepherd of Hermas." *

Dr. Adeney says :— †

"The book must be very ancient, almost contemporary with the Synoptics, and it contains some fragments of historical tradition and teachings of Jesus, the neglect of which is unwarrantable. Still more unjust is it to treat this gospel as a heretical work, wilfully perverting the true tradition of Christian origins. Assuredly it is honestly written ; and there is no reason to doubt the good faith of its author."

It is important to note with regard to the length of G.H. that according to the Stichometry of Nicephorus this Gospel was only 2,200 lines, while St. Matthew's was 300 lines more ; ‡ yet G.H. contains a very large portion of Matthew. It has sentences or narratives parallel to those contained in no less than sixteen chapters of Matthew,§ also it has some amount of extraneous matter ; probably including the story of the woman taken in adultery, and certainly one and possibly all of the Sayings of Jesus found in the

* S.P.C.K. Eusebius, ubi sup. See Fragments (6), (25), pp. 18, 40, below.

† "Hibbert Journal," Oct. 1904, p. 159.

‡ Dr. James, p. 1 ; Nicholson, pp. 102, 116.

§ Matt. ii, iii, iv, v, vi, vii, x, xi, xii, xv, xviii, xix, xxi, xxiii, xxv, vixxi.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri.* It seems very difficult to imagine that the contents of G.H. can have been compressed into the 2,200 lines of Nicephorus, unless it was written in very small characters, or with many abbreviations.

This Gospel rather resembles St. Mark's in its careful record of small details. Thus, it tells us that the man with a withered hand was a mason, that the rich man " scratched his head " in his perplexity, that the poor, neglected by him, " were clad in filth," and that the lintel of the Temple which fell was " an enormous size."

Mr. Hugh Schonfield, who had been of the Hebrew persuasion, and became a Christian, has a very high opinion of the Gospel of the Hebrews, as may be seen below :—

" In referring to Apocryphal Gospels we exempt the *Gospel of the Hebrews,* so widely used by the Judæo-Christian communities, which has every right to be considered as a canonical Gospel, if it be not the parent of them all. That it was so considered for several centuries the Fathers themselves are witnesses ; and that it ceased to be so is due to gradual corruption, and to the unique situation in which its audience was placed as a distinct body of Jewish believers " (*An Old*

* Dr. James, pp. 2, 25, 26. See Fragment (25). The occurrence of this same saying in G.H. and the Papyri strengthens the argument in favour of the authenticity of both.

Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel, T. & T. Clark, 1927, p. 194).

Mr. Schonfield is also one of the Editors of *The Search* Review, which contains a variety of learned Jewish contributions, four of which are of a very out-of-the-way character.

Eusebius gives a somewhat different impression of the Gospel according to the Hebrews :—

" But now that we have this point, it is reasonable to sum up the writings of the New Testament already mentioned. Well then, we must set in the first place the holy quaternion of the Gospels ; which are followed by the book of the Acts of the Apostles. After this we must reckon the epistles of Paul ; following which we must pronounce genuine the extant former epistle of John, and likewise the epistle of Peter. After these we must place, if it really seem right, the Apocalypse of John, the views that have been held as to which we shall set forth at the proper time. These, then, are to be placed among the acknowledged writings. But of those which are disputed, nevertheless familiar to the majority, there is extant the epistle of James, as it is called ; and that of Jude ; the second epistle of Peter ; and the second and third of John, so named, whether they belong to the evangelist or perhaps to some other of the same name as he. Among the spurious writings are to be placed also the book of

the Acts of Paul, and the Shepherd, as it is called, and the Apocalypse of Peter ; and, in addition to these, the extant epistle of Barnabas, and the Teachings of the Apostles, as it is called ; and, moreover, as I said, the Apocalypse of John, if it seem right. (This last, as I said, is rejected by some, but others give it a place among the acknowledged writings.) And among these some have reckoned also the Gospel of the Hebrews, a work which is especially acceptable to such Hebrews as received the Christ. Now all these would be amongst the disputed writings ; but nevertheless we have been compelled to make a catalogue of these also, distinguishing those writings which the tradition of the Church has deemed true and genuine and acknowledged, from the others outside their number, which, though they are not canonical and even disputed, yet are recognized by most churchmen." *

Eusebius, however, also says : "As to the Apocalypse, the opinion of the majority is still to this day divided one way or the other. But at the proper time this question also will be likewise decided by the testimony of the Ancients."† This is said by Eusebius just before his long reference to the Apocalypse and other books.

* S.P.C.K. III, xxiv, xxv, p. 86.
† S.P.C.K., p. 86.

CHAPTER II.

THE RESURRECTION.

THE Gospel gives us two accounts of the Resurrection. Viz. (1) of His Appearance to the ten disciples and (2) His Appearance to James.

Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, ch. xvi, in the life of Ignatius, speaking of the Epistle of Ignatius "to Polycarp," inserts a testimony about the person of Christ, "from the Gospel which was lately translated by me" ; his words are : "But I both saw him in the Flesh after the resurrection, and believe that he is in the Flesh ; and when he came to Peter and those who were with Peter, he said to them : Lo, feel me and see that I am not a bodiless spirit (demon). And forthwith they touched him and believed."

Eusebius, from whom Jerome quotes, says this Epistle is to the Smyrnæans and not to Polycarp, which is an obvious mistake—the words (*saw him*) are also wrongly quoted.

Bishop Westcott gives the following translation :—

"When the Lord came to Peter and the Apostles (after His Resurrection) He said to them Take, hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit. And straightway they touched

Him and believed, being convinced by His flesh and by His Spirit." *

Some surprise has been expressed, both at the message by the Angels and at the express command of the Saviour that they should see Him in Galilee. They just went to Jerusalem. This is discussed at some length in "Peter the Convener," in Appendix I, under the title, "Why did the Disciples Stay in Jerusalem after the Resurrection and not go to Galilee at once?"

The Priest's Servant.

Among all puzzling things in this passage the Appearance to "the Priest's Servant" is the most difficult to explain. I have therefore written about it fully in Appendix II, and have made the suggestion that the Priest's servant is Simon Kephas, but I have also added the possibility that the Priest's servant actually means only what it says. Personally, I much prefer the explanation that the "Priest's Servant" means Simon Kephas.

The Appearance to St. James.

As to the two others which are the subject of this paper, I take the text from Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (p. 463), and append a translation which mainly follows the one he gives. I also give the Latin version of

* "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels" (Edit. 1874), p. 431.

this difficult passage from Jerome's *Life of James the Just* :—

Hieron. De Viris Illustribus II.

"Evangelium quoque quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes sæpe utitur, post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jacobus se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus (Gr. Anastanta ek nekron). Rursusque post paullulum: Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem. Statimque additur: Tulit panem et benedixit ac fregit et dedit Jacobo justo, et dixit ei; Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus."

"The Gospel entitled *according to the Hebrews*, which I lately translated into Greek and Latin, and which Origen often quotes, contained the following narrative after the Resurrection:

"'Now the Lord, when He had given the cloth (sindon) * to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him. For James had taken an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour on which he had drunk the cup of the Lord,

* This word "sindon" which Westcott translates "cloth," Nicholson translates "linen cloth." Perhaps "linen garment" would be the best rendering; see below.

till he saw Him risen * from them that sleep. Again a little afterwards, the Lord says, 'Bring ye a table and bread.' Immediately it is added, 'He took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave it to James the Just, and said to him, 'My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man has risen† from them that sleep.' "

This remarkable statement contains four members, viz. (1) the Appearance to the priest's servant ; (2) James' Oath ; (3) the Appearance to James ; (4) the Order for the Table, and the blessing of the bread and gift of it to James.

Let us for the moment *assume* that this narrative is a true one, and see how it corresponds with the information we have from the Canonical Gospels ; and for the moment let us postpone consideration of the Appearance to the priest's servant.

It is quite certain that James did *not* drink " the Cup of the Lord " at the Last Supper, which took place on the " same night that Jesus was betrayed " ; for this James—James the Just—was not present. He was neither one of the Twelve, nor a disciple, nor even a believer.‡ We know, however, that he became a believer § and ultimately

* So Westcott translates the word. Nicholson (p. 66) gives " rising again," and Baring Gould (p. 148) " rising."

† Westcott here has " has risen " ; both Nicholson and Baring Gould have " is risen."

‡ John vii, 5.

§ Acts i, 14.

Bishop of Jerusalem, and that he wrote the Epistle which bears his name.

St. Paul tells us the bare fact that Jesus appeared to James,* and this Gospel gives us some striking additions as to the manner and circumstances of this Appearance. So that to this extent St. Paul and the Gospel support each other. At the same time this Hebrew Gospel's story upon the face of it looks hopelessly untrue and merely a weird and extraordinary legend so long as it is supposed to contain the obvious mis-statement that James the the Just was present at the Last Supper ; and that the Appearance to St. James was on Easter Day, which latter statement is a direct contradiction of St. Paul. It is also incredible because it is supposed to say that the " sindon " which Jesus gave to the priest's servant was a burial napkin. And this makes the whole story unintelligible and unworthy of belief ; † and moreover is in conflict with St. John's ‡ and the other Gospels.

* I Cor. xv, 7.

† In a recent article in " The Expository Times " (August, 1928, p. 493) Dr. Dunkerley, following Bishop Lightfoot, reads " from that hour wherein the Lord (Dominus) had drunk the cup " instead of " from that hour in which he (James) had drunk the cup of the Lord." In this case the " Cup " would not be the cup of the Eucharist but the cup of suffering which Jesus Himself drank at His crucifixion. This reading would do away with the difficulty that James was not present at the Last Supper, but it only has the authority of a very inaccurate Greek translation of Jerome, while all the known Latin MSS. have the reading which I have given in the text. See Nicholson, pp. 67-9, where he states additional reasons against the reading " Dominus." Moreover, even with this change the story is still in direct conflict with the account given by St. Paul as to the date of the Appearance to James. Also giving the Napkin to the Priest's Servant still remains a contradiction of the Gospels. ‡ xx, 7. See also below.

This difficulty in entirely removed if we accept St. Paul's statement that the Appearance to St. James took place long after Easter Day and was one of the latest of the Appearances, and suppose that St. James, instead of taking his oath at the Last Supper (where he was not present), took it at some subsequent celebration previous to the Ascension.

For there can be no doubt that the disciples would not delay to obey their Lord's dying request ; moreover, our Saviour had given them an implied promise that He would drink wine new with them in His Kingdom, and the evidence given in the Acts supports this view. It is quite possible that the disciples met on Easter Sunday evening for the express purpose of making, for the first time, the Perpetual Memorial.

The Speakers' Commentary remarks that the Church may be said to have really commenced when the death of Christ fulfilled the typical meaning of the Jewish sacrifices and virtually abrogated them. " The periodical celebration of the Holy Eucharist commenced from that time and it is probable, though not expressly stated, that our Lord after the resurrection partook of it with His Disciples. See Luke xxiv, 30 ; John xx, 19, 26 ; Acts x, 41, compared with the evidence of the Apostolic practice of celebrating the Holy Communion on every Lord's Day, Acts xx, 7."

(Speaker's Commentary on Matt. xxvi, 29. " I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the Vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.") " New " here means, as the same Commentary says, " new " in quality or character . . . as referring to the new character given to the wine as an element in the Christian Sacrament.

It is somewhat startling to find a disciple of our Lord taking an oath, and such an oath as is here indicated ; but it must be remembered that James had only recently become a disciple, probably less than a month before, and that he had never heard of the Sermon on the Mount nor of our Lord's refusal to leap from the pinnacle of the temple, nor of His reproof of those who sought after a sign. It is clear also, that James was convinced that the Lord had risen from the dead. He would not have joined the disciples and partaken of the cup of the Lord had he not so believed. He had had the evidence of the Apostles as to at least two manifestations of Jesus on Easter Day and the Sunday after. In all probability he had the testimony of Thomas and of his own mother.* He had ample evidence for belief and was willing to stake his life upon it, and the risk did not seem to him to be a great one. He was an earnest

* Or Aunt, if Jerome is correct ; or Stepmother, if the view of Epiphanius is right—at any rate of a near relation with whom he was on most friendly terms.

believer in the efficacy of prayers, as we see in his Epistle, and as we learn from other sources, he also had a similar belief as to fasting ; Hegesippus tells us that he drank neither wine nor fermented liquors and abstained from animal food. Hegesippus * adds : " He used to enter the temple alone, and was often found upon his bended knees, interceding for the forgiveness of the people, so that his knees became as hard as camels' through his habitual supplication and kneeling before God."

He also relied, no doubt, upon the personal affection of his " brother," who would not be likely to leave him either to commit suicide or to the degrading humiliation of breaking his oath. This plan of swearing to abstain from food till something was done was not unusual†. The strangeness of the incident does not disprove its truth. The audacious statement of Thomas won its prize, and it may well be that James was encouraged to what seems to us awful rashness, by the acceptance and success of a half-believer.‡

The loving greeting, " My brother," is of the deepest interest, not only as showing us that we need not fear that Death destroys either earthly

* Eusebius, Book II, c. 23.

† Acts xxiii, 21.

‡ Another example of the success of boldness in striving with the Almighty is given by James' own remote ancestor in Genesis xxxii, 26.

relationships or family affection, but as throwing light on the strong regard that Jesus had towards his brothers. This last is illustrated again by the narrative as to the Baptism in this same Gospel of the Hebrews, which I quote below.

It will be noticed that St. Jerome after describing James' oath indicates a short break in his citation from the Gospel. The Gospel evidently recorded something which happened after the Appearance of the Lord and before His direction that the table should be brought. We can have no doubt that the Gospel here contained some cry of wonder or awe and perhaps a word of penitence from James, and possibly some reply of mercy and love from the Redeemer.

The scene of the Appearance to James was probably an upper chamber, bare and unfurnished, in which James was praying. There was no table in the room, but there were those near who could hear the Lord call for it, and one was soon available. Then followed what certainly seems to have been a celebration of the Lord's Supper. There is the Manual Action, the Blessing, the Fraction, and the Administration. All this could hardly have taken place and would hardly have been so carefully recorded, if the sole and only object had been to provide a meal for a hungry man.

The Appearance to the Priest's Servant.

Let us assume that the priest's servant has its material meaning. This, I take it, had nothing whatever to do with the Appearance to James except that it occurred shortly before that event. It seems to have been a distinct Appearance to the priest's servant when engaged upon his ordinary domestic duties, with which the linen cloth (sindon) was obviously connected. It should be observed that it is not stated in the Gospel that the events related in the narrative occurred immediately after the Resurrection.

The " sindon " was probably handed to the servant as an assurance that it was no incorporeal spirit that he saw.

It is quite in accordance with the histories in the Bible that the Appearance should take place to one who was engaged in his ordinary duties. Such was the case with the Manifestation at the Sea of Galilee, and it is in accord with the Oxyrhynchus saying, " Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me, cleave the wood and there I am."

The word Bishop Westcott translated simply as " cloth " is " sindon." It means cloth of linen or some other special substance. Some of the official garments or vestments of the priest are directed in Leviticus to be of linen (Lev. vi, 10). They were holy garments, ib. xvi, 4. Compare I Chron.

xv, 27. Nicholson translates it " linen cloth," and refers to the linen clothes in which Jesus was buried, Matt. xxvii, 59 ; where this same word " sindon " is used for the linen clothes. It is also used in Mark xv, 46 ; Luke xxiii, 53. St. John speaks of the linen clothes (xix, 40 ; xx, 5, 6, 7), and of " the napkin (soudarion) that was upon his head " (xx, 7), but does not use the word " sindon." In Mark xiv, 51, 52, we are told of a young man who had a " sindon " cast about him and he left the sindon and fled away naked.

This is translated " linen cloth," and was evidently a garment, not merely a piece of cloth ; and the word in the Gospel of the Hebrews' narrative may be an official linen garment of the priest, which his servant was preparing for use. This makes a perfectly possible, uncontradicted story, while the theory that it was a burial cloth or napkin is directly in conflict with all the four Canonical Gospels.

The impossible story of the Appearance to James on Easter Day is only made even more impossible by that of the Appearance to the priest's servant on that day.

There is no impossibility in the Appearances a few weeks later.

There is nothing improbable in a priest's servant being an early believer in the resurrection of Jesus. Many of that class would know some-

thing of His teaching and of His promises of a resurrection, and after that event some may even have received and believed statements made by those who had already seen the risen Lord. Mr. Nicholson suggests that this refers to the servant of the High Priest named Malchus.* As he had seen Jesus in the Garden and had been healed by Him, he would be very likely to make further enquiry and so be prepared to believe on Him.

The name of the High Priest's servant would hardly have been mentioned by the Evangelists unless in some way or other he was likely to be known to the readers of the Gospel. In any case, whether Malchus became a believer or not, his story of Gethsemane would be told to many of the priest's servants and would have roused some to make further inquiries as to Jesus.

Dates of the Appearances to St. James and the Priest's Servant.

We are now in a position to consider the dates and places of the three events, viz., the Appearances to the priest's servant and to James, and of the Lord's Supper at which the Oath was taken. Probably they were all near together. The narrative seems to suggest that as to the

* Matt. xxvi, 51; Mark xiv, 47; Luke xxii, 50; John xviii, 10. It is "the servant of the High Priest," and St. John gives the name Malchus. See also John xviii, 15, 26.

Appearances, and we may be quite sure that Jesus would not allow James to fast very long.

The Oath could not have been taken on Easter or the following Sunday, as Jesus was present. After that Sunday the disciples went to Galilee.* The Appearance to the priest's servant was probably at Jerusalem, so we may fairly assume that all three events took place in Jerusalem, and that the Lord's Supper, at which James took the oath, was celebrated on some Sunday after the Apostles returned to that city. And this agrees with the statement of St. Paul (I Cor. xv, 7, 8), who places the Appearance to St. James very near the end of his list.

Latham takes the view that it was a short time after he had showed Himself to the company on the Mount, and perhaps three weeks before the Ascension.† If, however, the Appearance took place at Jerusalem the fifth Sunday after Easter would be the more probable date.

Conclusion of the Account of the Appearance to St. James.

In conclusion I wish to say that though I am somewhat doubtful whether the account of this Gospel of the Appearance to St. James is true, I certainly say that it may be true, and that I

* John xxi, 1. Gospel of Peter (end). This, of course, was not written by St. Peter. Its date is said to be about A.D. 170.

† "The Raisen Master," pp. 320, 322.

earnestly hope that Theologians and Critics will give it their earnest consideration and enquire into it anew. With the explanations here given it is entirely uncontradicted by the Canonical Scriptures but I much prefer that the Priest's Servant means Simon Cephas.

CHAPTER III.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH.

(*a*) *The Baptism of Jesus.*

THERE are two passages in this Gospel about the Baptism of Jesus quoted by St. Jerome which are specially interesting, and taken together afford strong evidence to show that the writer of the Gospel believed in the Virgin Birth, or to speak more accurately, in the Virgin Conception.

Let us for the moment *assume* that these two passages—Fragments (3) and (5), and also Fragment (4)—are true, and see how they correspond with the information we have from the Canonical Gospels, and whether the narratives themselves give an account which is consistent.

The first relates to a conversation which took place before the Baptism.*

[*To the Editor.—These printed sheets are taken from a book of my own, written in 1874.*]

Jerome, Book III, "Against the Pelagian Heresy," Epist. 17.

(3) "In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is written in Chaldee and Syriac, but in Hebrew letters, which the Nazarenes use

* The second is given below.

even now, according to the Apostles, or as most think, according to Matthew, which is in the Library of Cæsarea, the following history is related :—

" ' Behold the mother of the Lord and His brethren spake to Him, John the Baptist baptizes for the remission of sins, let us go and be baptized by him. He said to them, How have I sinned that I have need to go and be baptized by him, unless perchance My saying this proceed from My not knowing.' (Nicholson, 36–79.)

(4) " And in the same volume :—

" ' He said, If thy brother sin in word, and make thee satisfaction, receive him seven times in a day. Simon His Disciple said to Him, Seven times in a day! The Lord answered and said to him, I tell thee also, even to seventy times seven.* For in the prophets also, after that they were anointed by the Holy Spirit, a word of sin is found.' " (Nicholson, 48, 81.)

In the above conversation of Jesus with His Mother before His baptism we find Him unconscious that He had ever sinned. This shows that He already considered Himself more than Man (for no Jew, well-instructed in the Scriptures,

* Matt. xviii, 21; Luke xvii, 4.

could possibly imagine that he was without sin) * and at least suggests His Divinity. His succeeding words, indicating His doubt as to whether He had need to go and be baptized by John, emphasizes the deep humility and self-emptying of Jesus and His complete Humanity, as showing that He had not only bodily weaknesses like ours, but even a share in the trial of doubt—of course only temporary—as to what He should do. And finally He submitted to baptism with, though not as one of, sinners.† And then this Gospel proclaims the glories surrounding His baptism as clearly as, and yet in quite different words from the Evangelical Narratives. The Gospel here also gives an additional illustration of love for and deference towards His Mother, which lasted until the very end. He well illustrated the text, " and he that feareth the Lord will be a comfort to his mother." I cannot refrain from adding, how pleased Luther would have been if he had read of the Blessed Virgin saying that she would go to be baptized if John was baptizing for the remission of sins! On the other hand, it might well be added to the " joys " of Mary, which are often recounted, that she counselled " her own son Jesus " to be baptized.

* " There is no man that sinneth not," I Kings viii, 46.

† See below.

The Second Fragment quoted by Jerome and reproduced here,* as to our duty of forgiving the sins of others, is noteworthy ; as the declaration to the effect that Prophets though anointed with the Holy Spirit were not free from sin, gives us reason for saying that in His suggestion that He was free from that taint, He was claiming to be Someone above even the anointed prophets. Also here again is a narrative different from the Canonical Gospels, and therefore additional evidence.

The next Fragment contains a distinct testimony to the Divine Origin of Jesus, and refers to the Holy Spirit as His Mother.

St. Jerome, " Commentary on Isaiah," xi, 2.

(5) " According to their Gospel, which is written in Hebrew, and read by the Nazarenes, the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit descended upon Him.† . . . Besides, in that Gospel just mentioned we find these things written :—

" It came to pass, when the Lord ascended from the water, the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon Him, and said to Him ; My Son, in all the

* See above. It is printed in this place as it occurs in the same Volume of Jerome as the previous one concerning the Baptism.

† See John i, 3-34. Compare the accounts of the Baptism in Matt. iii, 17 ; Mark i, 11 ; Luke iii, 22 ; and see note in Gore's " Comm. on Mark," i, 11.

Prophets, I was waiting for Thee that I might rest on Thee, for Thou art My rest, Thou art My First-born son, Who reignest for ever." (Nicholson, 43.)

The Latin word used in the last sentence is " primogenitus," which (following Nicholson, Westcott, and Dunkerley) I have translated " first born." Dr. James translates it " first begotten." *

Here Jesus is spoken of as the Son of the Holy Spirit, and so far this agrees with the doctrine that " He was conceived by the Holy Ghost " (see below). At the Incarnation, the Holy Spirit came upon Mary. This is quite different from the way He came upon the Prophets, or after long waiting upon Jesus at His Baptism. Jesus was not constituted the Son of God by or at His Baptism, but was so " in the beginning." This is quoted by Jerome in his Commentary of Isaiah,† and Jerome would not have cited the passage if he thought it had taught anything heretical. " Rested upon him," is the Curetonian Syriac of Matt. iii, 16 (Nicholson, p. 43).

Now this account of the Baptism cannot by any possibility have been derived from either St. Matthew or St. Luke ; so that it seems that we have, in this Gospel, an additional and independent witness to the Virgin Birth.

* Compare Heb. i, 6 ; Col. i, 18 ; Rev. i, 5 ; and see Nicholson's note, p. 40.

† See below.

There is still another passage probably connected with the Baptism of Jesus which appears in St. Jerome's Writings and which will be cited hereafter. I will quote now two citations by Jerome from the Gospel to the Hebrews* which show that the Holy Spirit was spoken of in that Gospel as the Mother of Jesus.

(5a) "In Isa. xi, 11, My mother the Holy Spirit."

(5b) "In Ezech. xvi, 13, My mother, the Holy Spirit."

The strangeness of the Phrase is far less when we remember that, as Jerome explains, in Hebrew (i.e., Aramaic) the Holy Spirit is spoken of as feminine.

In Semitic language there is no neuter, and Rûh, the word for wind or spirit, is feminine; in the older Syriac literature, therefore, before the influence of Greek theology made itself felt, the Holy Spirit also is feminine. Thus in the old Syriac version of John xiv, 26, we actually read, "The Spirit, the Paraclete, she shall teach you everything."† And, if Mr. Rendel Harris's reading of Ode 36 of the Odes of Solomon is

* They are given in Westcott's "Introduction," App. C, p. 459; and Dr. James, p. 5. The passages which I have indicated by (5a) and (5b) are, I think, merely references to Fragments (5) and (6), and not separate Fragments of the Gospel.

† F. C. Burkitt, "Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire," p. 37. See also ib., pp. 38, 39. Jerome says that there is no sex in the Powers of God, and that the Holy Spirit is spoken of as Feminine in Hebrew, Neuter in Greek, and Masculine in Latin (Nicholson, p. 80).

correct, it refers to the Holy Spirit as the Mother of Jesus ("Odes and Psalms of Solomon," by J. Rendel Harris, 1909, p. 132). Ode 19 (ib. p. 114) certainly testifies to the Virgin Birth. See also pp. 75, 76.*

I remember a clergyman, when catechising the children in church, saying to explain the Incarnation, "Each of us has a Father and Mother, but Jesus had no earthly father; God was His Father." I took this to mean: That God the Father, the First Person of the Holy Trinity, our Heavenly Father, was to Jesus instead of an earthly father; but evidently the teaching of both the Canonical Gospels and Creeds is that the origin of the Man Christ Jesus was from the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and that this was what the clergyman intended to teach.

I must not, however, leave this portion of my subject without mentioning that some writers hold that these references to the Holy Spirit as "Mother" are "Ebionite" or "Gnostic," and quite unreliable. Mr. Nicholson, however, gives good reasons for showing they are perfectly orthodox and refer to the Incarnation.

It is rather puzzling that Origen, when quoting the phrase, takes the trouble to justify it at some length, on the ground that even men who do the Will of God are called by Jesus His Mother and

* For the Syriac text of the Odes, see the end of that Volume.

His brethren, when a simple reference to the Virgin Birth, in which Origen was a devout believer (Origen against Celsus, Book I, chs. xxxii *et seq.*) would have been the simplest answer. But Origen's love for fanciful interpretations may account for his method of argument. He, however, supports the phrase as a genuine portion of the Gospel of the Hebrews and as of some authority.*

It is most important to notice that The Odes of Solomon, which were undiscovered when Mr. Nicholson wrote, strongly confirm the view that the "Mother" refers to the Incarnation.

Mr. Roderic Dunkerley says † of Fragment (3), "I consider that we have here a fragment of early and reliable tradition, and an agraphon of real importance." And as to Fragment (5),‡ "Here I agree with Holtzmann, Menzies, and others in thinking this has much more the appearance and tone of a real communication made by Jesus to his friends than of a mere invention."

Personally, I do not think it probable that either of these Fragments were really sayings of Jesus, but think they may represent a very early tradition.

* See Fragment 6.

† "Expository Times," July, 1928, p. 442.

‡ Ib. August, 1928, p. 490.

(b) The Flight to Mount Tabor.

Perhaps the most remarkable of the Sayings recorded in the fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews which we possess is the following :

(6) "Just now my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs and bore me up on to the great mountain Tabor."

This is quoted by Origen in Comm. in Joh. ii, Par. 63, 64, Book II, Brooke's Edit., Vol. I, p. 73, and again but without the words "one of my hairs" in Homil. in Jer. xv. These words are, however, given by Jerome in Comm. in Mic. vii, 6.* Jerome also qnotes this Fragment in Comm. in Isai. xl, 11 (lib. xi), see Nicholson, 80. This passage is discussed by Nicholson in pp. 17, 74, 79–81. Thus the first and important part of this Saying is quoted twice by Origen and twice by Jerome.

If genuine it certainly seems to support the accounts of the Virgin Birth—or rather the Virgin Conception—as given in the opening chapters of SS. Matthew and Luke.

As to the phrase "took me by one of my

* Origen introduces the words thus :—"But if anyone admits the Gospel according to the Hebrews where the Saviour himself says, etc." So Jerome in the Comm. introduces it with the remark "He who has read the Song of Songs . . . and has believed the Gospel published according to the Hebrews which we have lately translated in which it is said in the person of the Saviour, 'Just now,' etc." As Mr. Nicholson says (p. 18) "it is pretty clear that Jerome thinks peolep ought to believe the Gospel according to the Hebrews."

hairs," * compare " took me by a lock of mine head " (Ezek. viii, 3), and bare him by " the Hair of the Head," in Bel and the Dragon, verse 36. Also with Acts viii, 39, 40 ; I Kings xviii, 12 ; and II Kings ii, 16. Nicholson's notes on this passage 74–82 are well worth reading. I agree with him in thinking the incident refers to the Temptation, where the Gospels say " the Spirit driveth him forth " (Mark), and that He was " led up of the Spirit " (Matthew). If we translate this passage in the Gospel of the Hebrews into modern phraseology we shall render the first portion " The Holy Spirit by whom I was incarnate." See above.

The carrying by " one hair " is at first sight startling, but this is no ground for the rejection of the Saying as spurious when we consider the texts above quoted, and also the " taking " of Jesus " into an exceeding high mountain " and " setting him on the pinnacle (or wing) of the Temple " (Matt. iv, Luke iv). No method of levitation is here stated, and—*assuming* that the Canonical Gospel account of the Temptation is literally true—no method of physically taking Him to the top of the mountain or to the top of the

* " The single hair " suggests the exceeding lightness or perhaps absence of weight of the spiritualized Body of Jesus. This seems to be a characteristic of the spiritualized body. See Matt. xiv, 25-9; Mark vi, 45-51 ; John vi, 19-21 ; I Thess. iv, 17. As to the Hair as representing the whole body, see also Matt. x, 30 ; 2 Sam. xiv, ii ; I Kings i, 52.

pinnacle can be suggested without seeming to us to be very strange.

Before discussing this further, it will be well to consider when and in what circumstances the words could have been said. Some writers suggest the Transfiguration, others the Temptation, and I agree with Mr. Nicholson that this latter is more probable, especially as Origen mentions them in close connection with the Baptism.* Different views are taken of the Temptation, some holding that it is a narrative of physical objective facts ; others agree with Dean Farrar. I will quote both him and also Gore's Commentary.

Farrar says in his *Life of Christ*, pp. 122–3, that " Very few writers in the present day will regard the story of the temptation as an actual objective fact ; and that, from Origen down to Schliermacher, some have regarded it as a vision or allegory—the symbolic description of a purely inward struggle . . . but the one essential point is that the struggle was powerful, personal, intensely real—that Christ for our sake, met and conquered the tempter's utmost strength."

In Gore's Commentary † on Matt. iv, 1–11, I find the following note on the Temptation of the Messiah :—

" The narrative must have come from the Lord

* " Comm. on John," see above.

† The Comments on St. Matthew are written by " P. R. Levertoff and H. L. Goudge."

himself ; and should probably be accepted as it stands, as there seems no reason why He should have described normal human experiences in such language as this (cf. Ezek. viii, 3 ff. ; II Cor. xii, 2–4). There is much evidence that there are times when, especially perhaps after prolonged fasting, while the body appears wrapped in slumber, its possessor is conscious of being present in some other place. Israel's struggle with Satan is in the Jewish lections a New Year and Day of Atonement *motif*, and the destined Head of the new Israel must reproduce Israel's experience (cf. carefully Deut. viii, 1–3)."

Mr. Nicholson (p. 75) conjectures that the above passage in the Gospel of the Hebrews belonged to the answer of Jesus to the Temptation by Satan in Matt. iv, 7 ; and suggests that, adopting the text of Matthew, the Temptation by Satan and answer of Jesus would run thus :—

" ' If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down : for it is written, ' He shall give His angels charge concerning thee ; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.' Jesus saith unto him, ' It is written again, ' Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' *Just now my Mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs and bore me up on to the great mountain Tabor.*' "

Mr. Nicholson's comment on this is, " Jesus is

asked to throw Himself down in reliance on the promise of God, to prove that He is the Son of God. He replies that we are forbidden to try God in this manner, and adds that He has already experienced the truth of God's promise, since He has just been borne up by a single hair on to Mt. Tabor."

Jesus must have been perfectly familiar with Ezek. viii, 3, where we read :—

" And he (the Lord God) put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head, and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem, to the door of the gate of the inner (court) that looketh toward the north."

I doubt whether Jesus or His contemporaries would have seen anything more strange in the taking by a single hair than by a lock ; any more, indeed, than if the narrative had simply stated that he was " caught up," without any particular method being specified. It is stated by Mr. Edward Thompson in his work on *The Reconstruction of India* (Faber, London), p. 57, that " the tiki, the tail of hair kept by the orthodox Hindu (is) popularly supposed to supply a hold whereby he may be tugged into Heaven."

The whole " scenery " of the accounts of the Temptation is remarkably Jewish. According to the Rabbis and Jewish legend we are told that

"In the hour when King Messiah cometh, He standeth upon the roof of the Sanctuary, and proclaims to Israel saying, 'Ye poor (suffering), the time of your redemption draweth nigh . . . and all shall come and fall on their faces before Messiah and before Israel' (Edersheim i, 293). I cannot give the date of these sayings, but if known to Jesus these promises of a Messiah standing triumphant on the Pinnacle would aggravate the temptation, and if we take the view that it was presented to the Mind and Soul of Jesus, would account for the shape it took. Strangeness and weirdness are the natural characteristics of a Vision or experience "out of the body."

I do not, however, agree with Mr. Nicholson's conjecture that the striking statement recorded in the Gospel of the Hebrews can have been made to Satan. I think it is more likely if it was made at all—that it was said by Jesus to His Mother.

Now, as Gore's Commentary points out, the story of the Temptation must have come from the lips of Jesus, and it must have been told to His disciples or to some member of His family or both. It is not likely that He told the former until after the great Confession of St. Peter at Cæsarea Philippi—especially if His account included the saying in the Gospel of the Hebrews which we are discussing. But—and this I only put as a possible solution—He *may* have given the full account to

His Mother. According to this Gospel she and his "brothers" asked Him to be baptized (see above), and we know that he ultimately was baptized. It is natural to suppose that the whole family went together, and that after He was baptized * His Mother would wish to speak to Him, but "straightway" (Mark i, 12) He rushed —or was rushed—away to the wilderness.†

On His return He would naturally explain to Mary why He had hurried—or been hurried—away, so that He could not speak to her, and then He *may* have given her an account of the Temptation. Later on He confided to His disciples the history of His temptation.‡

The introductory words of the sentence "just now" may be fairly taken to mean "a short time ago," and denote the brief period between the Baptism and the Return, during most of which Jesus was under special mental and spiritual conditions.§

* The R.V. reads Luke iii, 21, "when all the people were baptized, that Jesus also having been (not was) baptized."

† I do not, however, see any note of this hurry in any other of the Evangelists.

‡ Probably at different times with the variation in the order of the Trials as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke, and omitting for obvious reasons the mode in which He was led up as stated in the Gospel of the Hebrews.

§ In ordinary speech "Presently" often does not mean "immediately," and in law "Forthwith" has been held to mean "in a reasonable time." Expressions as to time must not be construed too rigidly. In the Oxford Dictionary "only a very short time ago," is indicated as one of the equivalents of "Just now." The writer of the Gospel could only have heard the story third-hand, and it is not safe to assume that we have the actual words which were spoken.

At first sight there seems something incongruous in representing Jesus as telling Mary that "He was made man by the Holy Spirit"; but this—if said—may have been a gentle reminder to her of His Divinity, similar to the saying of nearly twenty years before, "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's House." *

Whether the carrying up to Mount Tabor narrated by the Gospel of the Hebrews was objective or subjective, or whether Jesus was "in the body or out of the body," or when it took place, is quite immaterial, *if* He uttered the words with reference to the Holy Spirit, which this Gospel declares that He did. And even if He did *not*, the statement of this early Gospel must carry weight as showing the belief of the writer or compiler.

The Gospel also supports this doctrine, inasmuch as it affords a strong presumption that the second chapter of St. Matthew, containing the account of the Virgin Birth, was known and recognized by the writer of this Gospel. For it seems clear that Jerome found *all* the following phrases in the Gospel of the Hebrews :—

(7) "Bethlehem of Judæa (Matt. ii, 5)."

(8) "Out of Egypt have I called my Son (Matt. ii, 15)."

* "Or about my Father's business."

(9) "He shall be called a Nazarene (Matt. ii, 23)." *

(c) *The Date, Composition, and Authorship of the Gospel.*

Before proceeding further with regard to the evidence given by this Gospel as to the Virgin Birth, it is necessary to consider its date, composition, and authorship. The date is uncertain—it is generally given as about A.D. 100, though personally I am inclined to believe it was earlier.

If we may trust the careful, learned, and most orthodox Jerome—one of the four Doctors of the Church—St. Ignatius quotes this Gospel as genuine (see p. 4 above). And Ignatius is (as far as we know) the first person outside the New Testament, except perhaps the writer of the Odes of Solomon, to mention the Virgin Birth; but this Gospel was probably written some time before the epistle of Ignatius. Possibly the Odes of Solomon were written before Ignatius, but it is not likely that they are earlier than this Gospel.

It is obviously taken from "St. Matthew"—whether a Greek or Aramaic Gospel, or "the

* For proof of this, see Nicholson, pp. 18, 31-3. Dr. James (Apoc. N.T.P. 4) quotes Bethlehem of Judah as found in Jerome. The following is the statement of Jerome in his Commentary on Matt. ii, 5 :—"Bethlehem of Judæa . . . this is an error of the copyists. For we think that the word given originally by the Evangelists, as we read in the Hebrew, was Judah, not Judæa." The Latin is "Judæ non judææ."

Oracles of Matthew," * I will not pretend to determine †—and another source or sources, which I will for convenience denote as X.‡

Let us *assume* for a moment that the Gospel is authentic, and we at once come to the conclusion that the information contained in X is derived ultimately from information given by some member of the Holy Family. This follows from the narrative connected with the Baptism (Fragment 3), the Appearance to James (Fragment 2); and, if my conjecture is correct, from the conversation with the Blessed Virgin after the Baptism (Fragment 6).

Dr. Gore (p. 327) says that "The record of St. Luke's first two chapters must rest upon Mary's word mediately or immediately." § One of the most likely persons to whom Mary would confide the "mystery" was her son James. There was a most remarkable likeness, both in belief

* See Gore, 318.

† Or from some source of Matthew. Canon Streeter holds that the Gospel of Matthew as we have it is derived from Mark (A.D. 60), Q (A.D. 50), a Jerusalem source which he calls M (A.D. 65), and Antiochene Tradition. M, he considers, was of a Jewish character. He throws out the suggestion (in his remarks in a comparison of Matt. xviii, 15, 16, 21, 22; Luke xvii, 3, 4, and Fragment 4, see above) "that the same Jerusalem tradition which we have postulated as the source M used by Matthew was incorporated in, or in some way affected the text of 'G.H.'" ("The Four Gospels," pp. 250, 257-260, 512.)

‡ It is evident that the information as to the Virgin Birth in Fragments (5), (6) is not taken from Matthew or Luke.

§ He thinks St. Luke had it from one of the women who associated with the Apostolic Band after the Resurrection—possibly from Mary herself (p. 317).

and character, between them. The thanksgiving of the Magnificat that not only the poor were filled, but that the rich were "sent empty away," finds a parallel in the Epistle of St. James,* who actually expects the rich to rejoice when they are made low, and attacks them in terms remarkably vigorous for one who lays such great stress on the government of the tongue. I do not know where in the other Epistles any such strong strictures on the rich are to be found.

But the stress which he lays on the government of the tongue and, what is infinitely more telling, the mode in which he conducted his whole life, powerfully remind us of the reticence and self-control of the Blessed Virgin. At the beginning she "kept all these sayings in her heart" (Luke ii, 51).

At Cana though longing as she did to see her Son's Glory manifested, and to relieve her friend's anxiety, she is most careful not to ask Him to act.

She simply lays the facts before Him, and then (notwithstanding the check she received) prepares the servants for any action he might think fit to take. Later on, she stood outside patiently waiting until He had finished His preaching (Matt. xii, 46–7).

And finally, by far the most striking instance of

* For the evidence showing that this Epistle was written by the Lord's brother, see "The Epistle of James and Judaic Christianity," by G. H. Rendall, cited by Gore, p. 628 note; and also below.

her wonderful self-control, appears in her silence when she stood beside the Cross, without any cry to Him to exercise His power to release Himself or to call on His Father to release Him, or even to express her own sorrow or sympathy.

It is evident that James, though a devout believer in Christ, was for many years beloved and respected by the Jews in Jerusalem. Hegesippus tells us that he entered into the Sanctuary and asked forgiveness for the people, and that " on account of his exceeding great justice he was called 'The Just' and 'Oblias,' which is in Greek " bulwark of the people " and " justice," as the prophets show concerning him." *

It is obvious that if he had preached like St. Paul all this would have been impossible. He must have shown wonderful reticence and gentleness in teaching Christian Doctrine.

" James was the head of the Judaizing Christians, i.e., the Jews who had embraced Christianity, but still lived as strict Jews, and were anxious to include in the new religion as large an element as possible of Pharisaic Judaism." †

A vivid account of his martyrdom is given by Hegesippus. The Scribes and Pharisees came to him asking him to restrain the people from believing that Jesus was the Christ, and said :

* Eusebius, S.P.C.K. Edit., vol. i, p. 57.

† " The Century Bible," by Prof. W. H. Bennett, p. 26.

" For we bear thee witness, as do all the people, that thou art just and that thou acceptest not the person of any." * It is obvious from this that James often taught that " respect of persons " was evil. And here again we have a distinct echo of the Magnificat.

It is plain that the martyred James, the Lord's brother, was the writer of the Epistle that bears his name, and that he and his mother were one in mind and heart, so that there is a distinct probability that she confided the mystery of the Virgin Birth to her beloved son James as well as to her adopted son John.†

The probability that X was connected with James is increased, when we remember that the Gospel of the Hebrews was received as authentic by the Nazarenes, though not by other Churches. It shared with the Epistles of James and of the Hebrews the position of being a doubtful or disputed book.

These documents, written for the Jews, did not obtain acceptance in all the Churches in primitive times, though the Epistles to the Hebrews and of James were gradually, and finally universally, accepted.

The parentage of Jesus by the Holy Spirit is plainly indicated in Fragments (5) and (6) if they

* Eusebius, ubi sup.

† See John I, 13, 14; Gore, 315, 316; and Streeter (" The Four Gospels," p. 70).

are construed literally and without any fanciful interpretation ; and it is evident that any information as to the Virgin Birth in X was taken from some source other than Matthew or Luke, so that here again is an illustration of the evidential value both of X and the Gospel of the Hebrews.

CHAPTER IV.

THE LIFE, TEACHING AND MIRACLES OF JESUS

IN the following section I indicate this Gospel as G.H. ; Mr. Nicholson's book as N. ; and the Articles of Mr. Dunkerley in the *Expository Times* of July and August, 1928, as E.T.

(*a*) *Jerome.*

(11) " In the Gospel . . . according to the Hebrews which the Nazarenes are accustomed to read, he is set down among the greatest criminals who hath grieved the spirit of his brother." This is the statement of St. Jerome in his Commentary on Ezech. xviii, 7 ; and he also quotes G.H. as recording that our Lord said :—

(12) " And be ye never joyful save when ye have looked upon your brother in charity " (Jerome, Comm. in Ephes. v, 4).

These beautiful sayings remind one of the Discourse in the Upper Chamber and in the first Epistle of St. John, though the language is quite different : " And they harmonize strikingly with the tone of the Epistle of St. James " (E.T., p. 494). For Latin text and notes, see N. 44.

Jerome, Book II, Comment on St. Matt. xii, 13.*

* See N 46.

(13) " In the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which we lately translated out of Hebrew into Greek, and which is by most esteemed the authentic Gospel of Matthew, the man who had the withered hand is said to be a ' mason,' and prayed for relief in the following words:—' I was a mason, who obtained my living by my hands ; I beseech Thee, Jesus, that Thou wouldest restore me to health, that I may no longer disgracefully beg my bread.' "

(14) Among the Marginal Scholia of Tischendorf's * Codex, a Greek MS. of the Gospel of St. Matthew of the eighth or ninth century, there is a note that " The Jewish Gospel " adds to Matt. xviii, 22, the last clause of Fragment 2, cited above from Jerome (p. 11) as to " a word of sin in the prophets." It is evident, therefore, that the " Jewish Gospel " both in this instance and in the following three cases means the Gospel of the Hebrews.

The other allusions to the Gospel of the Hebrews cited by Tischendorf from among these Scholia, are the three following :—

(15) Matt. iv, 5 : " The Jewish (Gospel) has not ' into the holy city,' but ' into Jerusalem '." (N. 43.)

* See Scrivener's Introduction, p. 125, and Dr. James, p. 7.

(16) Matt. xvi, 17 : " Barjona : the Jewish (has) son of John." (N. 48.)

(17) Matt. xxvi, 74 : " The Jewish : And he denied, and he swore, and cursed." (N. 61.)

(18) G.H. interprets " Barabbas " as meaning " the son of their Master " (Jerome, Comm. in Matt. xxvii, 16). (N. 61.)

(19) G.H. reads " that a lintel of the Temple of immense size was broken and divided " (Jerome, Comm. in Matt. xxvii, 51). (N. 62.)

And Jerome says also in a Letter to Hedibia, viii, 1 : " In the Gospel which is written in Hebrew letters we read, not that the veil of the Temple was rent, but that a Lintel of the Temple of a prodigious size fell down."

In Exodus in chapter xii, 6–8, it is written :—

" And the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it at even. And they shall take of the blood, and put it on the two side posts and on the lintel, upon the houses wherein they shall eat it."

Again, in Exodus xii, 22, it is written :—

" And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the bason, and strike the lintel and the two side posts with the blood that is in the bason ; and none of you shall go out of the door of his house until the morning. For the Lord will pass through to smite the Egyptians ; and when he seeth the blood upon

the lintel, and on the two side posts, the Lord will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you."

An architect tells me :—

"A lintel is a large stone which spans a door or window opening. When the earth shook (as I believe one of the Gospels states) the wall of the Temple doubtless felt it most at its weakest points, i.e., door and window openings, and the effect would be to break the lintel."

It is quite evident that the lintel was the chief thing broken. It seems to mean that the "middle wall of partition between Gentile and Jew has been broken down and that access to the Blood of Christ has been made available for the Gentile world."

There is no doubt that "lintel" is the true reading in the Gospel, though Matthew may have preferred to write, not inaccurately, the "veil of the Temple was rent."

This incident of the "lintel" is one more proof, in addition to "Barachias son of Jehoidah" (Fragment 22), of the truth of the Gospel.

The earthquake which caused the fall of the lintel has not necessarily anything to do with arousing the bodies of the Saints which were said to arise *after* the resurrection of our Saviour. The incident, if it really happened, would be

concerned with the circumstances in St. Peter's sermon.

(20) Matt. xxi, 9, Osanna barrama, i.e., Osanna in the Highest (Jerome, Letter to Damascus).

(21) "In the Gospel which is called According to the Hebrews, I found, instead of 'super-substantial bread,' 'Mahar,' which signifies 'to-morrow'; so the sense is, our bread necessary for the morrow,' that is 'of the future,' give us this day." Jerome (Comm. in Matt. vi, 11, N. 44).

As St. Jerome in his Vulgate has "panem supersubstantialem," it is much to his credit, as an honest writer though an acrimonious opponent in controversy, that he has told us of this reading, the importance of which is obvious.

The Greek word translated "daily" in our version is not known to exist elsewhere than in this passage, and in Luke xi, 3. The Syriac version, translated by Dr. Cureton, renders it, "constant of the day"; and the Peschito, "bread of our need," i.e., "the sustenance necessary for life."

(22) In the Gospel which the Nazarenes use, for "the son of Barachiah" we found written the son of Joiada (Jerome, Book IV, Comm. on Matt. xxiii, 35. N. 59).

"The reference must be to Jehoiada," Gore, p. 189, commenting on Matt. xxiii, 35.

Matthew—or at least our text of Matthew—is clearly wrong and G.H. right.

The last example I will mention is "Zacharias the son of Barachias" given in our text of St. Matthew, whereas the true reading is "the son of Jehoiada," as correctly given in G.H.

Nicholson writes as follows on this passage: —

"I believe that the Gospel according to the Hebrews has kept the original reading, and that the passage passed through three different forms: (1) *Zacharias son of Jehoiada*—so the original; (2) *Zacharias son of Barachias*—so a very early copyist (or the translator if the Greek Matthew *be* a translation), knowing only the minor prophet, and correcting, as he thought, the mistake; (3) *Zacharias* by itself—so some later copyists, correcting the real mistake of No. 2.

(*b*) *Papias, A.D. 130–45.*

(23) Papias says G.H. contained a narrative of a woman accused before the Lord of many sins (Eusebius Eccl. Hist. iii, 39, S.P.C.K. Vol. I, p. 101. No. 52, 53. See also Comm. in N. 7–8). This is most probably (Nicholson thinks certainly) the story of the woman taken in adultery, placed—or rather misplaced—at the end of St. John viii. Dr. James thinks there is a difference in details.*

* Compare S.P.C.K. Eusebius, vol. ii, 108, and Streeter, "The Fou Gospels," p. 340.

(*c*) *S. Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 200.**

St. Clement of Alexandria (Stroma ii, 9) writes "In the Gospel according to the Hebrews it is written :— †

(24) "He that wondered shall reign and he that hath reigned shall rest (or cease)." N. 3, 77. A similar Saying is attributed to Jesus in a papyrus recently discovered at Oxyrhynchus :—‡

"Jesus saith, let not him who seeks . . . cease until he finds, and when he finds he shall be astonished; astonished he shall reach the Kingdom, and having reached the Kingdom, he shall rest."

The fact that this Saying is found in G.H. raises a presumption that the whole thirteen sayings published in the two pamphlets by Grenfell and Hunt in 1897 and 1904 are all contained in G.H. Such is the opinion of Professor Evelyn White (*The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus*, Cambridge, 1920), and other competent scholars (see Dr. James, pp. 1, 26, 27).

It does not seem to me, however, that the arguments of Professor White are at all conclusive. The chief of them will be found on pp. xlix–lxvii

* See S.P.C.K. Eusebius ii, 194; Streeter, ubi sup. 57.

† Note the phrase "It is written"—which generally indicates a quotation from Holy Scriptures.

‡ Pamphlet by Grenfell and Hunt, published in 1904, p. 13. These writers instead of "reign," translate the word in St. Clement "reach the Kingdom."

of the introduction to his above-mentioned learned work. On the other hand, the Stichometry of Nicephorus assigns only 2,200 lines to G.H., 300 less than Matthew ; so that if the newly-discovered sayings are included in G.H. a considerable portion of St. Matthew must be left out. Yet we have in G.H. parallels to something in every chapter in St. Matthew except chapters i, vi, viii, ix, xiii, xvi, xvii, xx, xxiii, xxiv, xxviii ; as will have been seen. G.H. includes the Birth Chapter (see p. 26) ; while in the Fragments we have as to the Resurrection it has parallels with St. Luke and St. Paul (see pp. 4, 5). Of course, *all* these chapters of St. Matthew may be included, in whole or in part,* in G.H.

Origen A.D., 226–54. Homily VIII on St. Matt. xix.

(25) " It is written in a certain Gospel, which is entitled *According to the Hebrews*, if any one be pleased to receive it not as of authority, but only for illustration of the present question :—*

" Another rich man said to Him [Christ], ' Master, what good thing shall I do that I may live ? ' He said to him, ' Man, keep the law and the prophets.' He answered Him,

* Dr. James, p. 1.

* See Matt. xix, 16-24 ; Mark x, 17-25 ; Luke xviii, 18-25, for other accounts, and Nicholson, pp. 49-51.

' I have done so : ' He said to him, ' Go sell all that thou hast, and distribute to the poor, and come follow Me.' The rich man began to scratch his head, and was displeased ; and the Lord said to him, ' How sayest thou, I have kept the Law and the prophets, since it is written in the Law, ' Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, and behold many of thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clothed with filth, and ready to perish for hunger, and thy house is full of many good things, and nothing at all is sent out of it to them.' And turning about, He said to His disciple, Simon, who was sitting by Him, ' Simon, son of Jonas,* it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man [to enter] into the kingdom of heaven.' " (Origen, Latin Translation, Comm. on Matt. xix.)

This man was evidently a very stingy person, and nowhere are we told that Christ specially loved him. Christ Himself was probably a drinker of wine and did not follow the Baptist in his abstinence for meat. " Christ was called a wine-bibber and a gluttonous man," though we know that both epithets were slanders. It is remarkable also that John the Baptist suffered

* Or " John."

a similar slander as appears from the " Bishop of Mainz " :—

" Medieval Latin Lyrics," by Helen Waddell.

Heriger
Bishop of
Mainz, saw a
Prophet who
said he had
been carried
off down to
Hell.

* * * * * *

The liar said
" I was to
Heaven trans-
lated and
Saw Christ there
Sitting and
Joyfully
Eating.

John called the
Baptist was
Cupbearer,
Handing round
Goblets of
Excellent
Wine to the
Saints."

The Bishop
Said " Wisely
Did Christ choose
The Baptist
To be His
Cupbearer,
Because he
Is known not
To drink any
Wine."

Neither the prefix to the above quotation (" It is written in a certain Gospel," etc.) nor the quotation itself about the other rich man (see p. 72) are in our Greek Text of Origen, so Nicholson considers it doubtful whether it is from Origen, though inclined to think it is his. Dr. James (p. 6) suggests that it was found by the translator of Origen in some work of Jerome.

(*d*) *Eusebius.*

Eusebius * tells us :—

(26) " The Gospel which comes to us in Hebrew characters has directed the threat not against the hider, but against the abandoned liver. For it has included three servants, one which devoured the substance with harlots and flute-women, and one which

* Theophania (the Greek fragments in Migne's Edition of Eusebius iv, 155). I quote this from Nicholson, p. 60, where the Greek is given.

multiplied, and one which hid the talent; then that one was accepted, one only blamed, and one shut up in prison." *

Probably in the course of his three years' ministry Jesus told two rather different stories with the same moral.

Eusebius also says that "Christ Himself taught, as we have found in a place in the Gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language, in which it is said :—

(27) "I will select to Myself these things, very very excellent are those whom My Father who is in Heaven has given Me." (Theophania, iv, 12. See N. 5, 45.)

Another translation is, "I will choose me the good very good, etc." Dr. James (p. 3) translates it, "I choose for myself them that are good."

(e) *Marginal Notes.*

Notes in the margins of some MSS. of the Gospels refer to "the Jewish Gospel," which evidently means G.H.

Some of those have been mentioned above. The following are quoted from Dr. James, and are either from Tischendorf or Schmidtke. Dr. James (p. 6) quotes Schmidtke as saying that the notes were originally made between A.D. 370

* See Matt. xxv, 14-30; Luke xix, 11-27 (Parable of the Talents), and Nicholson, pp. 59, 60.

and A.D. 500 by someone who did his work at Jerusalem.

(28) Matt. xxvii, 65 : "The Jewish : And he delivered unto them armed men, that they might sit over against the cave and keep it day and night."

(29) Matt. x, 16 : "The Jewish has '(wise) more than serpents' instead of 'as serpents.'

(30) Matt. xi, 12 : "The Jewish has : 'is ravished (or plundered)'."

(31) Matt. xi, 25 : "The Jewish : 'I give thee thanks."

(32) Matt. xii, 40*b* : "The Jewish has not : three days and three nights." *

(33) Matt. xv, 5 : "The Jewish : Corban by which ye shall be profited by us." [I am indebted for this quotation to Dr. James.]

(34) Matt. v, 22 : "The word 'without cause' is not inserted in some copies, nor in the Jewish."

(35) Matt. vii, 5 : "The Jewish has here : If ye be in my bosom and do not the will of my Father which is in heaven, out of my bosom will I cast you away."

The above thirty-six † Fragments include, as far as I have been able to ascertain, the whole of the

* This verse is peculiar to St. Matthew; but see Luke xii, 50; John xii, 31, 32, and Gore, 159.

† Nicholson gives 31 (at pp. 145-62).

Fragments of the Gospel which are at present known. I have not included in this article a number of Fragments which possibly may belong to this Gospel, and are given by Mr. Nicholson, or Bishop Westcott or in my own book *Sayings*.* Nor have I included some which appear to belong to the Ebionite Gospel, viz. : Another account of the Baptism, a description of the calling of the Apostles, a description of John's baptism, and references to the passover and to sacrifice, which Nicholson includes (see pp. 36, 28, 33, 77), though marking them as " Ebionite." Dr. James altogether excludes these from the Gospel to the Hebrews and gives them as belonging to the Gospel of the Ebionites, pp. 8–10.† Further research may at any time bring to light the other portions of the Gospel or more information as to those we possess. Meanwhile, it is clearly a witness (in addition to the New Testament) in favour of the Virgin Birth, Baptism, Teaching,

* " Sayings ascribed to Our Lord by the Fathers and Other Primitive Writers, and Incidents in His life narrated by them, otherwise than found in Scriptures." J. T. Dodd, 1874.

† Dr. James says (p. 7) :—
" A commentary on Isaiah (liii, 12), by Haimo of Auxerre (cir. 850) has this apropos of the word 'Father, forgive them.' For, as is contained in the Gospel of the Nazarenes, at this word of the Lord many thousands of Jews that stood round about the Cross believed."
And he adds that on a copy of the Bible called The Aurora, in a MS., there is a note :—
" At the cleansing of the Temple :
" In the books of the Gospels which the Nazarenes use it is read that rays issued from his eyes whereby they were terrified and put to flight."
I cannot accept either of these as belonging to G. H.

Miracles, and Resurrection of Jesus, and to the Institution of the Lord's Supper.

And although I cannot declare that the Gospel is in all its parts historically true, or decide as to the authenticity of any particular Fragment, I can say that it offers an additional—not a new—picture of the Life of Jesus Christ, and one which is " altogether lovely." *

* It should be noted that in the one case of serious conflict between the Gospel of the Hebrews and our text of St. Matthew, namely, the father of the murdered Zacharias, G.H. is certainly right. See Fragment (23).

APPENDIX I.

PETER AS CONVENER.

Why Did the Disciples Stay in Jerusalem after the Resurrection and not go to Galilee at Once?

IT is quite clear that our Saviour, both before His crucifixion and afterwards, by the message of the Angels and with His own words, said that the Disciples "and Peter" were to meet Him in Galilee.* Yet we are informed that the Apostles stayed in Jerusalem for at least eight days and saw Him there.

This has been a surprise to many and by some even considered a difficulty. The fact seems still more surprising if we look at the number and details of the messages sent.

(i) *Before the Crucifixion.*

Matthew :

† "But after I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee." (Matt. xxvi, 32.)

* Matt. xxvi, 32; xxviii, 7, 10; Mark xiv, 28; xvi, 7; John xx, 17, 18. For the Angels sent the Message to the disciples "and Peter," Mark xvi, 7. He says "Tell my brethren," Matt. xxviii, 10. According to St. Luke (xxiv, 6-11) the women did in fact tell the eleven Apostles "and all the rest."

† I quote from the Revised Version.

Mark :

" Howbeit, after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee." (Mark xiv, 28.)

(ii) *Angels to the Women.*

Matthew :

" And go quickly, and tell his *disciples*, He is risen from the dead ; and lo, he goeth before you into Galilee ; there shall ye see him ; lo, I have told you." (Matt. xxviii, 7.)

Mark :

" But go, tell his *disciples and Peter*, He goeth before you into Galilee ; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you." (Mark xvi, 7.)

Luke :

" Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of Man must . . . be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered his words, and returned from the tomb, and told all these things to *the Eleven, and to all the rest* . . . told these things *unto the Apostles*. And these words appeared in their sight as idle talk ; and they disbelieved them." (Luke xxiv, 6–11.)

(iii) *Jesus to the Women.*

Matthew :

" Go tell *my brethren* that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me." (Matt. xxviii, 10.)

" But the *eleven disciples* went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them." (Matt. xxviii, 16.)

John :

(*Jesus to Mary Magdalene.*) " Go unto *my brethren*, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God. Mary Magdalene cometh and telleth *the disciples*, I have seen the Lord and how that he had said these things unto her." (John xx, 17, 18.)

Dean Farrar says :—*

" Why did they not go to Galilee immediately on receiving our Lord's message? The circumstance is unexplained, for the identification of Galilee with the peak of the Mount of Olives—now called Viri Galilæi, from Acts i, 11—is wholly absurd. Perhaps the entire message of Jesus to them is not recorded ; perhaps they awaited the end of the feast."

And Mr. C. C. Dobson † remarks in his recent book :

" If he did intend to meet them in Jerusalem why did He not delay His command to meet Him in Galilee ? Perhaps no complete answer to this query is to be found."

It does indeed seem strange that they should

* " Life of Christ," vol. ii, p. 441. Note.

† " The Risen Lord and His Disciples," p. 24.

have held a meeting on Sunday evening in the Upper Room. After the capture of Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane they fled and " scattered." St. John took the Blessed Virgin to his own lodging which must have been in Jerusalem, for she was too exhausted to have gone far. Moreover, both St. John and St. Peter met St. Mary Magdalene quite early on Sunday morning and must have been sleeping in Jerusalem. Probably the other disciples or most of them fled to Bethany, where they were staying ; though probably in different houses, as it is unlikely that the house of Lazarus could have accommodated the whole party. They were all utterly disheartened and—very naturally—terribly afraid of pursuit and of the tortures and death which might be their fate if they were taken. The Crucifixion and Death of their Master was likely to daunt the bravest. It is most unlikely that those who gained safety in Bethany and were deprived of their leaders, Peter and John, would have decided to hold a meeting in Jerusalem and in the most dangerous spot in Jerusalem, the Upper Room, which by this time was well known through the information given by Judas to their enemies. And, if they were found holding a meeting, it would naturally be inferred that it was for the express purpose of continuing the treason to Cæsar and the attacks upon the insults to the Jewish religion—or at least

to the Chief Priests and Pharisees—for which their Master had been crucified. The whole attitude of the Chief Priests shows how fearful they were lest the disciples should continue the propaganda. Even when the disciples did come to the Upper Room, after (as I suppose) receiving the information that Christ was risen and on the invitation of St. Peter, they were in fear of the Jews.*

Jesus appeared to St. Peter on Easter Sunday.† It is natural to suppose that after some expression of adoration by Peter and some word of forgiveness by the Saviour, Peter would, as on the Mount of Transfiguration, be loth to let Him leave ; and would beseech Him to come again soon and to show Himself to the other Apostles ; and that the Lord would probably promise to appear (or at least say that He might appear) the same evening in the Upper Room ; and that St. Peter would go to the other Apostles who were in various places in Bethany or Jerusalem, and invite them to come. St. Peter would be running a very serious risk, as he was not only the principal follower of Jesus, but had tried to resist the authorities at Gethsemane and might be charged with attempt to murder Malchus. But now he was " converted " from fear to the utmost

* Luke xxiv, 34.
† I Cor. xv, 5.

courage, and forthwith proceeded "to stablish his brethren," as Jesus had commissioned him to do. (Luke xxii, 32.)*

They needed "strengthening" after Gethsemane and the Crucifixion; and they had not seen the Lord as St. Peter had. However, they came. It is noteworthy that St. Ignatius in describing the meeting on Easter Sunday evening says He came "to those who were with Peter." † This special mention of Peter—which does not occur in the Canonical Gospels—would be natural if Peter were the Convener. Also the confused Shorter Ending of St. Mark speaks of "Peter and his companions,"‡ thus regarding Peter as the chief figure of the group.

The solution I suggest then is, that while Jesus at first intended His disciples to go at once to Galilee, He was moved by St. Peter's prayer and mercifully put an end to their agony of doubt by appearing to them that same evening. His Appearance to the whole body of the disciples—to 500 at once—took place later on in Galilee. We know that God has often changed His purpose in response to Prayer, and that every man, and indeed every sentient being, changes his purpose

* If this was not the occasion when Peter "strengthened his brethren," when did he? The word "strengthened" is used in the Authorised Version.

† Epistle to the Smyrnæans, C. 3. See also below.

‡ Or "those about Peter." This is in Codex L., and the Old Latin Codex Bobbiensis.

and his actions as circumstances change; so that this view is by no means incompatible either with the Divinity or Manhood of our Redeemer.

This statement of St. Ignatius above mentioned gives so much support to the proposed solution that it will be well to quote it more fully:—

"And when he came to those about (or with) Peter, he said to them, Take, feel me and see that I am not a bodiless demon (or spirit). And straightway they touched him and believed."

With this we should compare Luke xxiv, 33–43, where Peter is not specially mentioned, and we are not told that he did touch Jesus. This is evidently an independent account and not copied from the four Gospels. The passage is from St. Ignatius' Epistle to the Smyrnæans (C.3), who is stated by Jerome * to have quoted it from the Gospel which had been lately translated by him, i.e., the Gospel of the Hebrews. And it is referred to also by Jerome himself as "from the Gospel of the Hebrews" which the Nazarenes read.† My own opinion is that St. Ignatius,‡ if a pupil of St. John, is far more likely to have quoted from his memories of the teaching of that

* De viris illust., 16. See Nicholson, "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," 69, Dr. James, 4.

† Comm. in Isai. lib. xviii, Prol. See Nicholson, 71.

‡ It is not quite clear whether St. Ignatius was a pupil of St. John. It is so stated in the Antiochene Martyrdom of St. Ignatius, written about 550 (Wake 219), and has some support from a doubtful passage in Jerome; but Lightfoot doubts it.

Apostle whom he must have heard recounting this event very many times; especially as the passage which Jerome says was from the Gospel of the Hebrews is not an exact quotation from Ignatius. As Archdeacon Hunkin,* quoting Dr. Sanday, says "Ignatius reflects Johannine Teaching with extraordinary fidelity." And, indeed, this is obvious to any reader.

The fact that the Disciples touched Jesus reminds us very strongly of I John i, 1, where the Apostle says that not only did they see Jesus (obviously after the resurrection), but adds that "our hands have handled" Him. If my suggestion is correct, we find St. John speaking of himself and the other Disciples as being "with Peter" (John xxi, 2); and this gives confirmation to my solution (which is, I hope, at least "a scientific guess") that the assembly was convened by St. Peter.

* "Modern Churchman," March, 1932, p. 654.

APPENDIX II.

THE "PRIEST'S SERVANT" IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS.

THE Gospel of the Hebrews has been a puzzle for many centuries. It is undoubtedly of great importance, as it gives us independent evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus, and also records the Virgin Birth and some interesting incidents of Our Lord's life. But perhaps the most puzzling of all the statements in this mysterious and ancient gospel is its record of the appearance of Jesus Christ to the "priest's servant," and the handing to him by the Saviour of a "sindon."

In this article I suggest first that in the passage relating to the priest's servant the true reading gives us "Simon Kephas" for the words "priests' servant," and secondly that the sindon was none other than the garment which the young man left in the hands of those who tried to arrest him on the night of Our Lord's betrayal (Mark xiv, 51). I think the evidence of considerable weight as to the "priest's servant," but admit frankly that the suggestion about the sindon is a guess. I give

below my reasons for both guesses. If the second one should prove true, it would not only solve the difficulty in the Gospel of the Hebrews, but would also give us information about the lost ending of St. Mark.

In this Gospel of the Hebrews there are two Fragments dealing with the Resurrection, one of which narrates Appearances to two persons about whom the Canonical Gospels are silent. The first relates to the Appearance to the Apostles and others on Easter Day evening, and the second to an Appearance to St. James (the Just) and to "the priest's servant."

I will first give the Latin text of this Gospel from Jerome.

St. Jerome * in his book *De Viris Illustribus*, c. xvi, writes as follows on the Life of Ignatius :—

"Ignatius, Antiochenæ ecclesiæ tertius post Petrum apostolum episcopus, persecutionem commovente traiano damnatus ad bestias Romam vinctus mittitur. Cumque navigans Smyrnam venisset, ubi Polycarpus, auditor Iohannis, episcopus erat, scripsit unam epistulam ad Ephesios, alteram ad Magnesianos, tertiam ad Trallenses, quartam ad Romanos, et inde egrediens scripsit ad Philadelphinos et ad Smyrnæos et proprie ad Polycarpum, commendans illi Antiochensem

* Hieronymi "De Viris Illustribus" Liber. Ex Recensione Guilelmi Herdingii. Lipsiae in Aedibus B. G. Teubneri MCMXXIV.

ecclesiam, in qua et de evangelio, quod nuper a me translatum est, super persona Christi ponit testimonium dicens : 'ego vero post resurrectionem in carne eum vidi et credo, quia sit' ; et quando venit ad Petrum et ad eos qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis : 'ecce palpate me et videte me, quia non sum dæmonium incorporale.' Et statim tetigerunt eum et crediderunt."

This has been translated as follows by Dr. Ernest Cushing Richardson, Librarian of Princeton College :—

Chapter xvi.

"Ignatius, third bishop of the church of Antioch after Peter the Apostle, condemned to the wild beasts during the persecution of Trajan, was sent bound to Rome, and when he had come on his voyage as far as Smyrna, where Polycarp the pupil of John was bishop, he wrote one epistle *To the Ephesians*, another *To the Magnesians*, a third *To the Trallians*, a fourth *To the Romans*, and going thence, he wrote *To the Philadelphians* and *To the Smyrneans* and especially *To Polycarp*, commending to him the church at Antioch. In this last he bore witness to the Gospel which I have recently translated, in respect of the person of Christ saying, 'I indeed saw him in the flesh after the resurrection and I believe that he is,' and when he came to Peter and those who were with

Peter, he said to them 'Behold! touch me and see how that I am not an incorporeal spirit' and straightway they touched him and believed."

There are two points to be mentioned with regard to this passage of Jerome. His reference to Polycarp is an obvious slip, as he evidently meant Ignatius' Epistle to the Smyrneans, ch. iii. Dr. James mentions it, but indicates definitely that the name Polycarp has come into the text by mistake; and Nicholson does not even trouble to mention Polycarp. However, while the quotation from Ignatius gives the sense, it is not verbally accurate. I will here give the full text of Ignatius, both because of the variation and because it contains much that is of interest.

"But * I know that even after his Resurrection he was in the Flesh; and I believe that he was so. And when he came to those who were with Peter, he said unto them, *Take, Handle me and see that I am not an Incorporeal Dæmon.* And straightway they felt Him and Believed; being convinced both by his Flesh and Spirit. For this cause they despised Death, and were found to be above it. But after his Resurrection he did Eat and Drink with them, as he was Flesh; although as to his Spirit he *was* united to the Father."

Compare Luke xxiv, 33–43, where Peter is not specially mentioned, and we are not told that he

* "The Apostolical Fathers," by Abp. Wake, p. 195.

did touch Jesus. This is evidently an independent account and not copied from the Gospels. This passage is from St. Ignatius (Ep. ad. Symrn., c. iii) who is stated by Jerome * to have quoted it from the Gospel which had been lately translated by him, i.e., the Gospel of the Hebrews. And it is referred to also by Jerome himself as "from the 'Gospel of the Hebrews' which the Nazarenes read" † (see Nicholson 69, 71).

The special mention of Peter in the Gospel of the Hebrews may be easily accounted for if we are right in surmising that he convened ‡ the Apostles to the Meeting on Easter Sunday evening. When they heard Jesus say to His captors "Let them go" they gladly took this as a permission to themselves to quit the dangerous scene, and fled hastily in fear. They were in no condition on Friday, Saturday, or Sunday to arrange any Meeting. Peter, whose repentance followed on his sin, was "converted" by the appearance of Jesus to him (if not before), and it is natural to suppose that he told the other Apostles, and though they were desperately afraid of the Jews, "strengthened" and encouraged them to come to this Meeting.

* "De Viris Illustribus," 16. Lawlor and Oulton, in their S.P.C.K. Edit. of Eusebius, Vol. II, pp. 109-10, express doubt whether Ignatius is here quoting from G.H., but the doubt seems insufficiently founded. Dr. James (p. 6) quotes the passage given above as belonging to that Gospel without expressing any doubt.

† Comm. in Isai. lib. xviii, Prol.

‡ See "The Search," July, 1932, p. 247.

This special mention of Peter occurs also in what is known as the " Shorter Ending " of St. Mark's Gospel.

In the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark's Gospel we are told that a young man arrayed in a white robe said to Mary Magdalen and two other women that Jesus was risen and added, " But go tell his disciples and Peter he goeth before you into Galilee, there shall ye see him as he said unto you (vv. 5–7).

The Gospel proceeds :—" And they went out and fled from the tomb ; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them, and they said nothing to anyone for they were afraid."

This ends the Gospel of St. Mark according to most modern writers ; but we have in many MSS. etc., the ending vv. 9–16, which we find in our Bibles, and which is known as " the Longer Ending."

The shorter ending, however, which is contained in a few authorities of far less weight than those for the longer ending, runs as follows :—

" But all the things that had been enjoined on them they announced briefly to *Peter and his Companions.* And afterwards Jesus himself too appeared and sent forth through them from the East right to the West the holy uncorrupt preaching of eternal salvation." *

It has no claim to be authentic though its

* Gore's Commentary, p. 122.

place in *k** is sufficient to guarantee its early date. It may well have been put together in Rome in the second century A.D.

The Appearance to St. James, and to the Priest's Servant.†

As to the two other Appearances after the Resurrection recorded in the Gospel of the Hebrews I take the text from Westcott, and append a translation which mainly follows the one he gives :—

Hieron. de Viris Illustribus II.

" Evangelium quoque quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes saepe utitur, post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert : Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jacobus se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus (Gr. Anastanta ek nekrōn). Rursusque post paullulum : Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem. Statimque additur : Tulit panem et benedixit ac fregit et dedit Jacobo justo, et dixit ei ; Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus."

" [The Gospel entitled *according to the Hebrews,*

* This is Codex Bobiensis, or Bobbiensis. Reference is made again to this in connection with the Appearance to St. James.

† This appears on p. 24, but is recorded here making the Appendix more complete.

which I lately translated into Greek and Latin, and which Origen often quotes, contained the following narrative after the Resurrection :

" Now the Lord, when He had given the sindon to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him. For James had taken an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour on which he had drunk the cup of the Lord till he saw Him risen * from them that sleep. Again a little afterwards the Lord says, Bring ye a table and bread. Immediately it is added, He took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave it to James the Just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen † from them that sleep.] "

I have not translated the word " sindon " because it has various meanings ; it might mean cloth of linen or other substance, either " in the piece," or made up as a garment. Westcott translates it " cloth," and Nicholson " linen cloth." It is the word used in the Synoptic Gospels for the linen cloth in which Joseph of Arimathæa wrapped the Body of the Lord after the Crucifixion.

In the Synoptic Gospels the linen Cloths (not Clothes) which were left lying, are described by the word " sindon " ; in St. John's Gospel the

* Nicholson gives " rising again " and Baring Gould " rising."

† Westcott translates " has risen " ; both Nicholson and Baring Gould have " is risen."

word ὀθόνια * is used, which has the same meaning as Sindon, thus :—

ὀθόνιον fin. of ὀθόνη=a *piece of fine linen* : in pl. *linen clothes*, also *linen bandages* or *lint*—sail cloth.

σινδον a *fine* cloth, a kind of *cambric*; *fine linen*, *linen*, anything made of this cloth, a muslin or fine linen garment (used for Mummy cloth Hdt. ii, 86, *see* βυσσος).

The above Latin text of Jerome is taken from Canon (afterwards Bishop) Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*.† It is identical with the text given in Migne,‡ except that Westcott has inserted *Anastanta ek Nekron* into the text. Migne gives, parallel with the Latin, a Greek version by Sophronius of the *De Viris Illustribus*, including of course the passage in Jerome containing these words.

It is important to notice the exact words in the passage relating to the Appearance to the priest's servant ; for in the text given by Mr. Nicholson§ there is the word *Suum* after *sindonem*, making the passage read " his sindon," i.e., the Lord's sindon, while without it the question is

* ὀθόνιοις is the term used by St. John xix, 40 ; ὀθόνια in xx, 5, 6, and ὀθονιων in v. 7. The Napkin σουδάριον is mentioned in v. 7 ὀθόνη occurs in Acts x, 11 ; xi, 5 =a sheet.

† Fourth Edit. (1872), Appendix D, p. 463.

‡ S. Eusebii Hieronymi Opera omnia. J. P. Migne, Tomus Secundus Patrologiae Tom. xxiii, 1845.

§ Gospel according to the Hebrews (1879), p. 62.

left open whether the sindon belonged to the Lord, the priest's servant, or anyone else.

Neither *Suum* nor *Suam* (as it ought to be as sindon is feminine) is to be found either in Mignes' edition of Jerome or in several other editions which have been examined in the Bodleian Library and in that of St. John's College, Cambridge ;* so until some other evidence is produced we must take it that the text given above is correct.†

Let us for the moment *assume* that this remarkable narrative is a true one, and see how it corresponds with the information we have from the Canonical Gospels and St. Paul, and for the moment let us postpone consideration of the Appearance to the priest's servant.

It is quite certain that James did *not* drink

* Editions of Jerome examined at the Bodleian :—De Viris Illustribus : Earliest printed ed. (1473) ; Miroeus (1639) ; Fabricius (1718) ; Herding (1879), Teubner ; MS. Rawlinson, D. 338 (twelfth cent.) ; MS. Canon Misc. 437 (fourteenth cent.). Opera : Erasmus, 9 vols. (1516-20) ; Marianus Victorius, 9 vols. (1602) ; Vallarsius, 11 vols. (1734-42) ; Migne, Patrol. Ser. Lat. (1845).

The following editions of Jerome's works at St. John's College Library, Cambridge, were also examined. The word suum does not occur in any of these. (1) " Divi Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis opera omnia quae extant . . ." (Paris, 1534) ; (2) " Omnus quae extant D. Hieronymi Stridonensis Lucubrationes . . ." (Basle, 1537) ; (3) " Sancti Hieronymi stridoniensis opera . . ." (Colonial Agrippinae 1616) ; (4) " Sancti Hieronymi stridoniensis opera omnia quae extant." (Paris, 1623-4) ; (5) " D. Hieronymi operum Primes Tomus . . ." (Basle, 1565) ; (6) " Tomi i, ii, iii, D. Hieronymi stridoniensis . . ." (Antwerp, 1678) ; (7) " Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi stridonensis Presbyteri operum Tomus quartus . . ." (Paris, 5 vols., 1693-1706).

† It may be mentioned that instead of resurgentem a dormientibus Nicholson reads resurgentem a mortuis. There is the same readings in the Edition of Erasmus, 1526, but no suum or suam.

" the cup of the Lord " at the Last Supper, which took place on the " same night that Jesus was betrayed " ; for this James—James the Just—was not present. He was neither one of the Twelve, nor a disciple, nor even a believer. We know, however, that he became a believer, and ultimately head of the Church of Jerusalem, and that he wrote the Epistle which bears his name.

St. Paul tells us the bare fact that Jesus appeared to James ; and this Gospel gives us some striking additions as to the manner and circumstances of this Appearance. So that to this extent St. Paul and the Gospel support each other. At the same time this Hebrew Gospel's story upon the face of it looks hopelessly untrue, and merely an extraordinary legend, so long as it is supposed to contain the obvious mis-statement that James the Just was present at the Last Supper and that the Appearance to St. James was on Easter Day, which latter statement is a direct contradiction to St. Paul.

This difficulty is entirely removed if we accept St. Paul's statement that the Appearance to St. James took place long after Easter Day, and was one of the latest of the Appearances ; and suppose that St. James, instead of taking his oath at the Last Supper (where he was not present) took it at some subsequent Celebration previous to the Ascension.

However, I have discussed the Appearance to St. James in the text of this work, and so will not say anything more on the subject of St. James.

The Appearance to the Priest's Servant.

Now let us go back to the story of Our Lord's appearance to the priest's servant, which is undoubtedly a very difficult problem, it may be said at once that the narrative is so short and uncertain that it has no evidential value, and that it is impossible with our present knowledge to give any certain solution of this conundrum which Jerome had left us. Two possible solutions have been suggested, but I do not think that either is true. In any case I think we may fairly take it that this Appearance had nothing whatever to do with the Appearance to St. James except that it occurred shortly before that event.

One of these solutions is that the handing of the cloth took place immediately after the Resurrection, and that the Hebrew Evangelist, while telling us that a linen cloth was handed to the priest's servant, did not refer to the linen cloth in which the Lord's Body was wrapped, but only to some sheet thrown over the Body as it was carried to the tomb.

It is true that G.H. says that *after* giving the cloth to the priest's servant Jesus appeared to James ; but the Appearance to James *may* have been weeks after, for it is not unusual to find

events which are connected in thought or substance placed together. And if the Hebrew Evangelist compiled his gospel from several sources, he might not be very careful as to the Chronology. On this hypothesis and assuming the cloth was handed to the " priest's servant," there remains the question who he was. Was he Malchus* or some other official of the Chief Priest's who accompanied the Temple Guard to the tomb ? There were evidently some sympathizers with Jesus among the Officers of the Chief Priests, as they had on one occasion refused to apprehend him, and declared that never man spake like Him (John vii, 46). We are told that the Chief Priests and Pharisees went to the tomb with the Guard (Matt. xxvii, 66) ; and that after Jesus had left the tomb, some (not all) of them reported to the Chief Priests and Elders and received a large reward for spreading the report that the Disciples had stolen Him (Matt. xxviii, 13).

Possibly also if the above suggestion is correct, the priest's servant told some of his friends confidentially that he had seen the risen Christ. The result would be that crowds would flock to see the empty tomb ; and it is probable that many would wonder whether the statement which Christ had made, that He would rise again, could

* Matt. xxvi, 51 ; Mark xiv, 47 ; Luke xxii, 50 ; John xviii, 10. It is " the servant of the High Priest " ; and St. John gives the name Malchus. See also John xviii, 26.

possibly be true. This may help to account for the belief of 3,000 in the Resurrection, when St. Peter gave his evidence and preached his sermon at Pentecost.*

It may have been a distinct Appearance to the priest's servant when engaged upon his ordinary domestic duties, with which the linen cloth (sindon) was obviously connected. It should be observed that it is not stated in the Gospel that the events related in the narrative occurred immediately after the Resurrection.

The " sindon " was probably handed to the servant as an assurance that it was no incorporeal spirit that he saw.†

It is quite in accordance with the histories in the Bible that the Appearance should take place to one who was engaged in his ordinary duties. Such was the case with the manifestation at the Sea of Galilee ; and it is in accord with the Oxyrhynchus saying, " Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me, cleave the wood and there I am."

The word " sindon " † means cloth of linen or

* Before the Crucifixion many of the rulers believed on Jesus (John xii, 42) ; and some time afterwards " a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith " (Acts, vi, 7).

† Another hypothesis is that the Handing of the Sindon to the Priest' Servant took place long after the Resurrection and very shortly before the Appearance to St. James. This solution would avoid straining the phrase which occurring in G.H. certainly does suggest immediacy :— " Now the Lord, when He had given the linen cloth (sindon) to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him."

‡ See page above.

some other special substance. Some of the official garments or vestments of the priests are directed in Leviticus to be of linen (Lev. vi, 10). They were holy garments (ibid., xvi, 4 ; compare I Chron. xv, 27). In Mark xiv, 51, 52, we are told of a young man who had a " sindon " cast about him, and he left the sindon and fled away naked. This is here translated " linen cloth," and it may have been a garment, not merely a piece of cloth ; and the word in the Gospel of the Hebrews' narrative may be an official linen garment of the priest, which his servant was preparing for use, or a piece of linen which he was about to make up into a garment. This makes a perfectly possible, uncontradicted story.

There is nothing impossible in a priest's servant being an early believer in the Resurrection of Jesus. Many of that class would know something of His teaching and of His promises of a Resurrection ; and after that event some may even have received and believed statements made by those who had already seen the risen Lord. Mr. Nicholson suggests that this refers to the servant of the High Priest named Malchus. As he had seen Jesus in the Garden and had been healed by Him, he would be very likely to make further enquiry, and so be prepared to believe on Him.

The name of the High Priest's servant would hardly have been mentioned by the Evangelists

unless in some way or other he was likely to be known to the readers of the Gospel. In any case, whether Malchus became a believer or not, his story of Gethsemane would be told to many of the High Priest's servants, and would have roused at least some to make further enquiries as to Jesus.

I will not give any more attempted solutions now, especially as I have a strong suspicion that both the solutions are unsatisfactory; that the text itself is corrupt, and that G.H. really is telling us something about Simon Peter, and some copyist has turned this into "Servant of the Priests."

Besides the Gospel of the Hebrews there is one other ancient document where we find "the Servant" mentioned in connection with the Appearances of Jesus. This is known as the shorter ending of St. Mark as it appears in the Codex Bobbiensis (k) which is attributed to the fourth or fifth century.

Some of my readers may be reminded that notwithstanding the very able, though somewhat acrimonious, defence of Dean Burgon, it is generally recognized by Scholars that the last twelve verses printed at the end of St. Mark's Gospel in the Authorized Version (vv. 9–20) inclusive, were not written by St. Mark and are no part of his Gospel.* They are usually known

* See e.g. Gore's Commentary, pp. 122-4. In the R.V. the position is indicated by a space between verses 8 and 9, and a cautionary marginal note.

as the "Longer Ending" of St. Mark, and have been conveniently called an "Appendix" to the Gospel. Besides this, there is another ending known as the "Shorter Ending," and it is thus given in the above-mentioned Codex.

"But all things whatsoever were told them, they also who were with the servant briefly explained. After these things also Jesus Himself appeared, and from the East even even (*sic*) to the East (*sic*) sent to them the holy and incorruptible (preaching ?) of eternal salvation. Amen." *

Taking this statement at its face value, the question immediately arises, who was the servant ? Reading St. Mark's Gospel backwards we find the first servant mentioned is the one who questioned St. Peter, but she cannot possibly be the person indicated here, as *puero* is masculine.† The next servant mentioned is the servant of the High Priest whose ear St. Peter struck off.‡

But how could Malchus or any other servant possibly be with those ? Presumably it was the woman mentioned in Mark xiv, 66, who "briefly explained." It is far more likely that "puero" is a mistake for "Petro," and this is the more probable since we find in this short passage the words "to the East" where obviously "to the

* Dodd, pp. 58, 94, 99.

† Mark xiv, 66.

‡ Matt. xxvi, 51. Called in St. John xviii, 10, Malchus. "Sayings," p. 58.

West" is intended. If a further reason for this proposal for reading "Peter" for "the Servant" is needed, it may be found by considering other inaccuracies of this very ancient Codex.

Fortunately, however, we are not left to depend on any argument from improbability; for we actually find another version of this passage in Codex L.* This is as follows:—

". . . But all things that were told them they briefly explained to them that were with Peter: and after these things Jesus sent by them from East to West the holy and incorruptible preaching of eternal salvation. . . ."

Here we have "Peter" instead of the "Servant," and are quite sure that "Peter" is the true reading in Codex Bobbiensis.

Can it be that the true text of the Gospel of the Hebrews referred to "Simon Kephas" or to "Simon," and that this has been corrupted into "The Priest's Servant"? It must be remembered that in this inquiry we are not dealing with certainties but only with probabilities and possibilities.

We now come to a vital point in the question. What could the original text of the Gospel have been, and how could the transformation into the "Priest's Servant" have taken place; and what

* Tregelles suggests this and so does Gore. The latter simply ignores the reading of "the Servant."

is the evidence of the probabilities of such change?

With regard to the question how could "Simon Kephas" or "Simon" become "The Servant of the Priest," there is no very great difficulty if we consider the frequent and marvellous mistakes made by copyists. In the Aramaic language Simon Kephas will be SMcWN KYP', while "The Priest" will be KHN' (Cohen).*

If the first three letters of Simon are used as an abbreviation we obtain SMc KYP', and this could be mistaken for SM^{c} KHN'; and this which means "one obedient to the Priest" could be translated—or mistranslated—into "The Servant of the Priest," although the word SMc does not really mean a servant.

I may add that "Servant" is a very wide word. "The Borrower is Servant to the Lender" (Proverbs xxii, 7). "His Servants ye are whom ye obey" (Rom. vi, 16). "Servants of sin" occurs often.

The chief difficulty seems to me to arise from the transformation into KHN'; but this may be accounted for by the word "Priest" in Matt. xxvi, 51† or elsewhere, having caught the copyist's

† The Gospel of the Hebrews contains a reference to the vigorous denial by Peter. Compare Mark xiv, 51, 52, where a young man was wearing a "Sindon."

* It is very possible that G.H. was written in small characters or with abbreviations, as it probably contained much matter in a small space.

eye, so that the mistake may come under the wide heading of Homoioteleuton as Canon Streeter in his *Four Gospels* (p. 565) explains that word; or simply from "want of concentration," i.e., "woolgathering"—thinking of something other than the words to be copied.

I can speak here from my own experience. Many years ago a young clerk was copying a paper of mine for the Church Congress where the words "Holy Matrimony" occurred; and he wrote "Holy Communion." In a legal draft of mine there was the name Hepinstall; and he wrote "Parkin." I could explain the mistakes as I know the circumstances, but I doubt if any of my readers can.

For examples of the mistakes of copyists I have not to go far. There are two in the very brief shorter ending of St. Mark as recorded in the Codex Bobbiensis which was mentioned above.* There is another in the same Codex which gives Mark xvi, 4 as follows:—

"But suddenly, at the third hour, the shadows of day (?) overclouded the whole earth, and angels descended from heaven, and they rise (?) in the brightness of the living God, ascended together with Him, and immediately there was light."

Obviously the true reading is "At the third

* Pp. 190, 191.

hour of the day the shadows overclouded," etc.*

The Codex W., which gives a third ending of St. Mark, also seems to contain a mistake of the copyist.†

The last example I will mention is "Zacharias the son of Barachias" given in our text of St. Matthew,‡ whereas the true reading is "the son of Jehoiada," as correctly given in G.H.

Nicholson writes as follows on this passage:—§

"I believe that the Gospel according to the Hebrews has kept the original reading, and that the passage passed through three different forms: (1) *Zacharias son of Jehoiada*—so the original; (2) *Zacharias son of Barachias*—so a very early copyist (or the translator if the Greek Matthew *be* a translation), knowing only the minor prophet, and correcting, as he thought, the mistake; (3) *Zacharias* by itself—so some later copyists, correcting the real mistake of No. 2.

The difficulty of transformation of KYP' into KHN' might be met by supposing that the abbreviation used for KYP' was K'. If SM^{c} K' was written for SMcWN KYP' the mistake might have occurred.

* See Tischendorf's Greek Testament in loc. "Sayings," p. 99. We must read "diei tenebrae" instead of "tenebrae diei"; and the opyist seems to have made another mistake besides.

† See Gore's Commentary, and Canon Streeter on the Four Gospels, p. 257.

‡ Matt. xxiii, 35. Of course, the mistake is not the fault of the Apostle.

§ N., p. 59.

It is more likely, however, that the original reading of G.H. was : " Now the Lord when he had given the Sindon to Simon," and that some copyist wrote : " When he had given the Sindon to the Servant." And a subsequent copyist, in a laudable endeavour to make sense of the passage decided that " the servant " was the priest's servant mentioned in Mark xiv, 47, and so wrote : " When he had given the Sindon to the Priest's Servant."

However this may be, the probability that G.H. wrote " Simon " or " Simon Kepha " is certainly increased by what we know of " the Holy Shroud " of Turin and the traditions as to other rival Shrouds, because whatever may be thought of the genuineness of these relics, it is clear that there exists an early traditional association of the Holy Shroud with St. Peter and with St. Mark's Home.

In the Cathedral of Turin on May 3rd, 1931, the ceremony took place of the exposure of the famous Holy Shroud in which, according to tradition, the Body of Christ was wrapped after the Crucifixion, leaving in it the impression of His features.

The relic is jealously preserved in the Cathedral of the capital of Piedmont, and is shown only at long intervals by permission of the Kings of Italy, who are its trustees. The occasions of this showing throughout the centuries have been

McMaster University LIBRARY

either some solemn family event in the House of Savoy or notable religious occurrences. During the last century it was exhibited six times, the last being in 1898, when the Sacred Art Exhibition was held in Turin.* Splendid pictures of the Shroud are given in the *Illustrated London News* of May 9th and 16th, 1931. Roman Catholics themselves differ as to the genuineness of the Shroud. The early history of it is confessedly very obscure. There seems to have been a Shroud at Constantinople in A.D. 1200 which *may* be identical with this sheet, but the history of the Turin Shroud does not seem clear until A.D. 1335.†

Those, however, who believe in the authenticity of the Shroud rely on the relic itself, the photographs and the careful chemical and scientific experiments that have been made. For an account of those, as well as for the history of the Shroud,‡ I must refer the reader to *The Shroud of Christ*,

* " Times," May 5th, 1931, p. 13.

† See Vignon, p. 55.

‡ " The Catholic Encyclopædic Dictionary " (1931), to which the Bishop of Menevia has written a preface, mentions " the alleged Shroud of Christ preserved in the Cathedral of Turin." And it is stated that " Half a dozen other places have similar relics with proper offices for various days," and that " it is practically certain that no one of these relics is genuine." Also Chevalier states that " the Turin Shroud was not produced before the fourteenth century, and is probably no older." See Tit. " Chevalier," Encyc. Britt. (1910). There were a large number of rival shrouds ; but Dr. Beecher shows that there were only three which had the necessary qualification for rivalry with the Shroud of Turin, as they only had a figure of the Crucified upon them, and Dr. Beecher summarily dismisses any claims on their behalf. It should, however, be stated that both the Catholic Encyc. and Dr. Beecher's opinions were both stated before the Exposition.

by Paul Vignon, D.Sc. (Fr.), translated from the French, and *The Holy Shroud*, by the Rev. P. A. Beecher, and the interesting remarks of Monsignor Barnes in the *Illustrated London News of May *6th*, 1931.

Personally I do not believe that the Turin Shroud* is genuine. There seems to be nothing In the Canonical Gospels to show that a shroud or anything beyond the grave-cloths (not clothes) was used in connection with the preparation for the Tomb.†

However, it is very possible that some sheet was laid over the sacred Body ; and as is stated above, we have the definite testimony of the Gospel of the Hebrews that our Saviour " handed the Sindon to the Priest's Servant."

Also, according to Dr. Beecher,‡ St. Nino, who died in A.D. 338, made three references to *a* shroud in connection with the burial and resurrection of Jesus. These are as follows :—

(1) " As to the Shroud it was not found (with the clothes), some said of St. Peter that he had taken possession of it to keep it and to guard it.'

* I have employed the term " Shroud " in accordance with popular usage ; but I have it on high Roman Catholic authority that " sindon " would be a better word.

† Matt. xxvii, 59 ; Mark, xv, 46 ; Luke xxiii, 53. See Beecher 14. According to St. John, Joseph and Nicodemus bound the Body in linen cloths with the spices (John xix, 40).

‡ " The Holy Shroud," pp. 167-73. Id. p. 169, quoting " Historie de la Georgie," p. 93, translated by Brosset.

(2) " The Shroud was taken away by Peter."*

(3) " Now they did not find the Shroud (Sindon) but it is said to have been found by Peter, who took it and kept it."†

St. Nino dictated her life story in the year 338.

According to tradition the Shroud was kept in Jerusalem in the house of the mother of St. Mark. This is slight information, but it is at least consistent with the history as given by St. Nino, because St. Mark was the special friend and disciple of St. Peter.

In my opinion the large number of Shrouds without the picture, and the testimony of St. Nino and others, seem to give some confirmation, however slight, to the statement in G.H., that there was a shroud used for the Burial, or at least indicate a very early tradition ; and the connection of the Shroud with St. Peter and St. Mark's home form a substantial argument in favour of the reading " Simon " or " Simon Kepha."

The handing of the Shroud by Our Lord is not a very probable story, but if it is true it is far more probable that St. Peter was the recipient rather than Malchus or other priest's servant.

* Id. 170, quoting the " Chronique Armenienne," p. 20, translated in French by Brosset.

† Id. 171, quoting the " Life of St. Nino," p. 10-11, from Part I of Vol. V of " Studia Biblica et Eccl.," translated from the Georgian by M. and J. O. Wardrop.

My Suggested Explanation—The Appearance of Jesus to Peter.

It is quite obvious that the words " After He had given the sindon to the priest's servant " only contain a portion of the narrative in G.H., and that they *must* have been immediately preceded by an account of some conversation of Jesus with someone, and of the delivery of the sindon to Him. The improbability of the story as it stands recorded is great. It is much more probable that the text is corrupt, and that the Hebrew Evangelist really wrote some account of the Appearance of Jesus to Simon Kephas, and said nothing about any priest's servant.

We have it for certain, both from St. Luke and Cephas, that on Easter Sunday, before Jesus appeared to the Eleven, He appeared to St. Peter alone (Luke xxiv, 34 ; I Cor. xv, 5). We are also practically certain that the Lost Ending of St. Mark's Gospel contained an account of this Appearance,* as Mark would not have given the message from Jesus to Peter (xvi, 7) unless he was also intending to record the Appearance. The important question arises then, *where* did Jesus appear to St. Peter ? It was hardly likely that the interview took place in the streets of Jerusalem. Most likely it was in the place where Peter was lodging.

* Gore's Commentary, Part III, p. 123.

And here it would be quite possible that the Lord took up a " sindon "† and handed it to Peter, as a proof that He was not a bodiless spirit. Indeed, it is not improbable that St. Peter was lodging in the house of his friend St. Mark, and that the sindon which the Saviour handed was the very sindon which St. Mark left in the street.* Mark might have recovered it, and would not be likely to have worn it again until it had been washed.

The connection between St. Peter and St. Mark's house at a later date is described in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible† as follows :—

" Mark Mother Mary, the friend of Peter (Acts xii, 12) appears as a woman of some wealth, the possessor of a house with a πυλὼν and with a room large enough to contain many, the mistress, it would seem, of a household, the duty of one παιδσκὴ being to keep the door (cf. John xviii, 17). Her house is one of the centres of the life of ' the brethren ' at Jerusalem. Peter goes there as a matter of course directly he had escaped from prison, and is well known there (Acts xii, 14). It is a natural conclusion that ' the house of Mary ' had become the home of St. Peter, and

† Edersheim (ii, 545) says this corresponds to the Sadin or Sedina which means a linen cloth or loose wrapper.

* Mark xiv, 51.

† Vol. III, p. 245.

that the guest was in a sense the head of the household (cf. I Peter, v, 13).* "

It is the opinion of many that St. Mark was the young man who dropped the sindon on the night of Our Lord's arrest (Mark xiv, 51). The following is the description of the incident given in the Gospel :—

" 50. And they all left him, and fled.

" 51. And a certain young man followed with him, having a linen cloth cast about him, over his naked body :

" 52. And they lay hold on him ; but he left the linen cloth, and fled naked. And they led Jesus away to the high priest."

It is as well to add to this the Greek of verses 51 and 52 :—

51. καὶ εἷς τις νεανίσκος ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ, περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ. καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτὸν οἱ νεανίσκοι.

52. ὁ δὲ καταλιπὼν τὴν σινδόνα γυμνὸς ἔφυγεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

The Rev. M. F. Sadler, in his notes on this passage remarks, " the extreme simplicity of the incident, almost amounting to the ludicrous, makes us ask why was it mentioned at all, except that it was St. Mark who desires to mention that he was once in the presence of the Lord." But this reason seems hardly sufficient, as we are not told that Mark was " the young man." Mr. Sadler's own

* There was a door as well as a gate, and as the house was in a town it must have been a house of some size.

explanation, viz., that " it is narrated to show us how in the matter of the escape of the Apostles the Lord's word was with power," seems even less sufficient.

It may also be questioned whether the whole story of the young man losing his sindon was worthy of record. It certainly was so *if* it turned out that this sindon was handed by Jesus to Peter. and *if* we are told this in the last ending of St. Mark : but this can only be conjectural. It is true that Papias gives the following tradition which he had received from the Elder :—

" This also the Elder used to say. Mark, indeed, having been the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately, howbeit not in order, all that he recalled of what was either said or done by the Lord. For he neither heard the Lord, nor was he a follower of His, but, at a later date (as I said) of Peter ; who used to adapt his instructions to the needs (of the moment), but not with a view to putting together the Dominical oracles in orderly fashion : so that Mark did no wrong in thus writing some things as he recalled them. For he kept a single aim in view : not to omit anything of what he heard, nor to state anything therein falsely."

However, Eusebius has a very poor opinion of Papias.* And modern opinion is that St. Mark

* Vol. I, Book III, xxxix, 13, 15. Pp. 100-1, S.P.C.K.

was the young man mentioned in the passage under discussion.

Dr. T. K. Cheyne and Dr. J. Sutherland Black, writing in the *Encyc. Britt.*, say :—

" He (St. Mark has) been identified with the un-named young man of Mark xiv, 51. This agrees with that interpretation of the Muratorian Fragment which takes the words ' *Quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit* ' as warranting the inference that Mark, though not in any strict sense a follower of Jesus, was present at certain incidents in his life."

Moreover, Professor Burkitt, writing very recently, is strongly of that opinion. He is clear that St. Mark writes his accounts of the events of the last days of the Passion from his own knowledge and not from any reminiscences of St. Peter. It is also considered by some that the young man (Mark) had been roused when Jesus went to Gethsemane and had followed him thither ; and that while the Apostles slept, he came near enough to hear our Saviour's prayer in His agony, and has recorded the event and the actual words of the Prayer to the Father.

After Jesus had been taken into custody it is evident that some of the priest's servants had tried to arrest the youth as likely to try to defend Jesus or to create disturbance ; probably they recognized him as an active supporter of Jesus or as a friend

of Peter. After he had run away there was no object in trying to stop him any more than in pursuing the Disciples, and as the sindon was of some value the priest's servant would naturally restore it to Mark's house ; and Jesus might find it in a room shared by Peter and Mark on Easter Sunday, as the house would be crowded for the Paschal Feast and only part of the room could be given to the Guest.

Practically we must regard the surmise that Jesus gave to Peter the very sindon that had been worn by Mark as a guess ; but we may fairly consider the reading in G.H. of " Simon Kephas " for the " priest's servant," and also that G.H. records the handing of some sindon to Peter, as at least scientific guesses.

INDEX

Adeney, Dr., 15.

Barachias, son of Jehoidah, 58–60, 99.
Barabbas, 57.
Baring Gould, 11, 22, 86.
Barnabas, 18.
Barnes, Monsignor, 102.
Beecher, Dr., 101, 102.
Bennett, W. H., 52.
Bercea (Syria), 14.
Bethany, 74, 75.
Bethlehem, 48, 49.
Black, Dr. J. S., 108.
Burgon, Dean, 94.
Burkitt, Prof. F. C., 38, 108.

Caesarea, 14, 34.
Caesarea Philippi, 46.
Cana, 51.
Celsus, 40.
Chevalier, 101.
Cheyne, Dr. T. K., 108.
Clement of Alexandria, 11, 61.
Constantinople, 101.
Cureton, Dr., 37, 59.

Damascus, 59.
Dobson, C. C., 73.
Dunkerley, Dr., 11, 23, 37, 40, 55.

Edersheim, 46, 105.
Enoch, 15.
Epiphanius, 25.
Eusebius, 12, 14, 17–19, 26, 52, 53, 60, 61, 65, 66, 83, 107.

Farrar, Dean, 43, 73.
Galilee, 20, 28, 31, 71–3, 76, 84, 92; *see* Appendix I.
Gethsemane, 30, 74–6, 94, 108.
Gore, Bishop, 36, 43, 46, 50, 51, 53, 59, 67, 84, 94, 96, 99, 104.
Grenfell & Hunt, 61.

Haimo of Auxerre, 68.
Harris, J. Rendel, 38, 39.
Hasting's Dictionary, 13, 105.
Hedibia, 57.
Hegesippus, 11, 26, 52.
Hermas, *see* Shepherd of Hermas.
Hieronymus, *see* Jerome.
Holtzmann, 40.
Hunkin, Archdeacon, 78.

Ignatius, 19, 49, 76–8, 80–3.
Irenæs, 11.

James, St., 19–27, 38, 50–3, 55, 80, 85–90.
James, Dr., 13, 14, 37, 49, 56, 60–2, 65–8, 82, 83.
Jerome, St., 11, *et passim.*
Jerusalem, 23, 31, 50, 52, 71, 74, 75, 89, 103–5.
John, St., 17, 18, 23, 29, 30, 55, 60, 74, 77, 78.
John the Baptist, 34, 35, 63–5.
Joiada, 58–60, 99.
Jude, 15, 17.

Latham, 31.
Lawlor & Oulton, 83.
Lazarus, 74.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 23, 77.
Luke, St., 14, 37, 41, 47, 50, 54, 62, 72, 104.
Luther, 40.

Magdalen, Mary, 73, 74, 84.
Mainz, Heriger Bishop of, 64, 65.
Malchus, 30, 75, 91, 93–5, 103.
Mark, St., 42, 47, 72, 76, 84, 94, 95, 98, 99, 103–7, 109.
Mary (Peter's friend), 105.
Matthew, St., 12, 14, 15, 17, 25, 29, 34, 37, 41–4, 47–50, 54, 58, 60, 62, 72, 99.
Menevia, Bishop of, 101.
Menzies, 40.
Mount Tabor, 41, 44, 45, 48.
Mount of Olives, 73.

Nicephorus, 15, 16, 62.
Nicholson, Edward Byron, 11 *et passim.*
Nino, St., 102, 103.

Origen, 11, 14, 21, 39–41, 43, 62, 63, 65, 86.
Oxyrhynchus, 16, 28, 61, 92.

Papias, 60, 107.
Paul, St., 17, 23, 24, 62, 89.
Peter, St. (Simon Kephas), 17–20, 32, 34, 71–9, 92, 96, 97, 99, 100, 103–5, 109.
Polycarp, 19, 81, 82.
Priest's Servant, The, *see* Appendix II.

Rendall, G. H., 51.
Richardson, E. C., 81.

Sadler, M. F., 106.
Sanday, Dr., 78.
Schliermacher, 43.
Schmidtke, 66.
Schonfield, Hugh, 16.
Scrivener, 56.
Shepherd of Hermas, 15, 18.
Simon Kephas, *see* Peter, St.
Solomon, Odes of, 38–40, 49.
Sophronius, 87.
Speaker's Commentary, 24, 25.
Streeter, Canon, 50, 53, 60, 61, 98, 99.

Tabor, Mount, *see* Mount Tabor.
Theophania, 65, 66.
Thomas, St., 25, 26.
Thompson, Edward, 45.
Tischendorf, 55, 66, 99.
Tregelles, 96.
Turin, 100, 101.

Vignon, Dr. Paul, 102.
Virgin, Mary, or Blessed Virgin, 33, 54, 105.

Waddell, Helen, 64.
Wake, Archbishop, 77, 82.
Wardrop, M. and J. O., 103.
Westcott, Bishop, 11, 13, 19–22, 28, 37, 38, 68, 85–7.
White, Professor E., 61.

Zacharias, son of Barachias, 60, 69, 99.
Zacharias, son of Jehoiada, 60, 99.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

PAGE

Abbreviation of the Gospels, may have been used 16
Abstention from Animal Food 26, 63
Apocrypha, New Testament is not one of these 16, 18
Appearance to St. James 20–32
Appearance to St. Peter and Ten Disciples 19
Appearance to the Priest's Servant 20, 28–32
Bosom of the Father, not doing His will, shall be cast away ... 67
Canonical Gospel, Hebrew Gospel not accepted as (except two opinions) 12, 13, 18
Celebration of the Lord's Supper at administration to St. James 24, 89
Cup of the Lord means His cup of suffering and not the Eucharist—Appendix II 23
Date of Gospel 49
Death does not destroy Relationship 26
Devil, or Tempter of Our Saviour, The 43
Eucharist, Perpetual Memorial of 24
Flute-women 65
Gospel derived from " Matthew " and other sources and derived in part ultimately from the Holy Family 49
Introductory. This contains the opinion of a number of writers 11–18
Life Teaching and Miracles excluding the Resurrection and the Virgin Birth 55–66
Lintel, an Architect's opinion on it 58
Lintel of Temple quoted three times in Exodus 57
Lintel means wall, a partition between a Gentile and Jew broken down 58
Malchus might be a believer 30
Man who devoured his Substance, The 65
Medieval verses 64, 65
Personal affection for (brother) 26
Priest's Servant may believe in the Resurrection 29, 30
Prophets liable to sin 36
Resurrection, The 19
St. James' Oath may have been taken on some Sunday after the second Sunday, but more probably taken on the fifth Sunday 31
Sindon=Aramaic or Hebrew.
Sindon means the Cloth of Linen or some special substance. It also means Holy Garments worn by the High Priest ... 28, 29
The Veil of the Temple was rent 57
The Virgin Birth plainly stated in the Odes of Solomon 39
The Virgin Birth plainly stated, though there are vague doubts 33, 37, 38, 40
The Virgin Birth, probably referred to in Matt. ii, 5, 15, 23 ... 48
Virgin Birth, probably confided to her son James 53
Virgin Mary carrying Him as His Mother 33–40
Virgin, reticence of her 51
Wine, new character in Sacrament 25